HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE

547

The Com
Rekha Sa
Ayurveda,
photograp
Mukunda
the necess
microfilm
including
be used for

00031779

00031779

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

VOL. IX.

Demy 8vo. 25*s. per* 2 *Vols.*

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE at the Close of the Middle Ages. By JOHANNES JANSSEN.

Vols. I. and II. translated by M. A. MITCHELL and A. M. CHRISTIE.

Vols. III.—X. translated by A. M. CHRISTIE.

LONDON:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

By Johannes Janssen

VOL. IX.

THE POLITICO-RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION FROM THE PROCLAMATION OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD IN 1580 UP TO THE YEAR 1608

31779 ac

TRANSLATED BY A. M. CHRISTIE

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

TT-K-9

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.
1906

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

These Volumes (IX. and X.) are translated from Vol. V. of the German [Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions, improved and added to by Ludwig Pastor].

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.

PREFACE

TO THE

THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH

(FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH) EDITIONS

In working at this new edition I was guided equally by two feelings—loyalty to the deceased author and respect for the progress of historical knowledge. The first of these considerations required that the original character of the work should be left intact, that all merely personal views of my own should be sunk as far as possible, and that only the most necessary alterations should be made. In accordance with these principles occasional inaccuracies have been rectified, important contributions from later research duly utilised, and, above all, supplementary matter added from the rich store of new literature which has meanwhile become available.

In many cases I have been able to make use of notes which Janssen himself had destined for a new edition. At the same time I have frequently, in the case of quotations, referred to later editions of the works

quoted from, and where necessary altered the passages cited.

Prelate Hülskamp, in his beautiful 'Necrology,' praises with full appreciation the immense care with which Janssen prepared his new editions, so that learned inquiry must not rest satisfied with consulting earlier editions. In this respect the procedure of my never-to-be-forgotten master has served me as a model.

My alterations and additions are, as far as possible, relegated to the notes, where they are indicated by two asterisks.[1]

For a large number of contributions to the present volume I am indebted to Dr. Falk, at Kleinwinternheim, near Mayence, to Professor Kaltenbrunner at Innsbruck, and to Dr. N. Paulus at Munich.

LUDWIG PASTOR.

Frankfort-on-the-Main,
Aug. 25, 1892–*June* 5, 1901.

[1] This plan has not been followed in the translation.

CONTENTS

OF

THE NINTH VOLUME

BOOK I

ADVANCING DISINTEGRATION OF THE EMPIRE AND GROWING SECTARIAN BITTERNESS UP TO THE FORMATION OF THE UNION IN 1608.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. CALVINISTIC SECULARISATION SCHEMES—PREPARATIONS FOR THE COLOGNE CATASTROPHE, 1581–1582 1

The Calvinists fear the formation of a league between the Lutheran and the Catholic imperial Estates—Mutual suspicion and hatred—Statement of the Count Palatine John Casimir—What the Count Palatine George Hans was aiming at, 1–4.

The revolutionary party in the Netherlands—John of Nassau and the 'League of Counts,' 4–6.

Archbishop Gebhard Truchsess of Cologne and the plan for the secularisation of the archbishopric dating from 1580, 6–14.

II. TRANSACTIONS AT THE DIET OF AUGSBURG IN 1582 . . 15

Fear of the Catholics prior to the Diet—Letters of the nuncio Bonomi, 15–17.

Protestant demands with regard to the abolition of the ecclesiastical reservation—Religious freedom—Elector Augustus of Saxony opposed to religious freedom, 17–21.

Complaints of the Protestants and counter-complaints of the Catholics, 21–25.

Transactions concerning the religious dissensions at Aix-la-Chapelle—The imperial Estates will grant no subsidies until their grievances are redressed, 25–33.

CHAPTER PAGE

Plans of the opposition at the Diet under the leadership of the Elector Palatine, 33–34.

Transactions concerning the condition of affairs in the Netherlands—Double attitude of France, 34–41.

Hopes of the revolutionary party in the Empire, 41.

III. The Cologne War and the contemplated Extirpation of the Papacy, 1582–1584 42

Proceedings of the Archbishop of Cologne—His religious edict of 1582—Attitude of the Cologne cathedral chapter—The Protestant Electors on the side of Gebhard—Gebhard sways backward and forward between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic creeds—Court festival and nuptials—Satan and the glory of God, 42–55.

Gebhard's 'evangelical war' in Westphalia from 1583—Forcible suppression of the Catholics—Iconoclastic riots and bestial carousals, 55–57.

Gebhard's deposition through Gregory XIII.—The new archbishop, Duke Ernest of Bavaria, and his supporters—Behaviour of the Spanish auxiliary troops in the archbishopric—The Electors of Mayence and Treves lend no help, 57–61.

Efforts of the Palatine Electoral Houses on behalf of Gebhard—A manifesto against the 'attempt' of the Pope—John Casimir's plans—Elector Augustus of Saxony condemns Gebhard's undertaking, 61–66.

Palatine transactions with the Electors of Mayence and Treves—Canvassing for the help of the States-General—The Calvinistic King Henry of Navarre organises a general Protestant League against the papacy and the House of Habsburg—Henry's ambassadors in England and to the German princes, 66–72.

The war on the Rhine, 1583—John Casimir's secret treaty with Gebhard and his evangelical war manifesto against the 'bloodthirsty aggressions of the Antichrist'—Fruits of the religious war—Gebhard in the camp of John Casimir—Protestant opinions on the warriors of God, 72–79.

The Palatine Elector Louis's summons to a Protestant convention at Mühlhausen—Death of the Elector and departure of John Casimir from the scene of war—Count John of Nassau on the general demoralisation, 79–82.

The Emperor's attempts at mediation—Diet at Rotenburg in the year 1584—'All sorts of dangerous intrigues' and the issue of the Cologne war—Elizabeth of England

CHAPTER PAGE

on Gebhard—His wife in England—Calvinist example for the Lutherans, 82–92.

IV. Abolition of Lutheranism and Reintroduction of Calvinism in the Palatine Electorate after 1583 . 93

The will of the Elector Louis overridden by John Casimir—Hatred of the Lutherans against the Calvinists—Louis's young son Frederick forced into Calvinism—Advice of the Landgrave William of Hesse—Heidelberg disputation between Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians in 1584, and its results—John Casimir and the Universities, 93–100.

Expulsion of the Lutheran preachers—How John Casimir justified the latter—Contemporary opinions on the results of Cæsar-papism—Controversial writings and pulpit quarrelling —Intercession of an 'exile of Christ,' 100–104.

V. Intrigues of Protestant Princes with Foreign Countries—Fear of the Pope and the Jesuits—The Emperor's Helplessness, 1584–1586 105

John Casimir and the Emperor—Complaint of Duke William of Bavaria, 105.

French conditions and John Casimir's relations to France and England in 1585—A Heidelberg pamphlet against the Catholic powers, 105–111.

The League and Sixtus V.—Alliances and plans for war—The Elector of Saxony changes his politics under the influence of a new marriage—All sorts of reports concerning the Pope's intentions—'A painting' published by the Prague Jesuits—Their bloodthirsty designs explained by Lucas Osiander—George Scherer's pamphlet in defence of the Fathers, 111–124.

The Catholic Estates without unity—William of Bavaria attempts in vain to form them into a league—The Emperor helpless and undecided—The question of succession in the Empire—John Casimir's hopes of the downfall of the House of Habsburg, 124–130.

VI. A 'Christian Military Expedition' against France—Transactions for the Formation of a Protestant Separate League—Impotence of the Catholic Estates, 1586–1591 131

Saxony joins in the Calvinistic Franco-Palatine intrigues —The Administrator of Magdeburg summons to a war for Henry of Navarre against the 'idolatrous papacy'—

CHAPTER PAGE

What he hopes from such a war—Treaty between John Casimir and Henry in 1587—Military expedition to France—Germans and Huguenots pillage and burn in Alsatia—Song of lament from the peasants, 131–135.

The Germans led to the slaughter-house in France, 135.

Plan for a new expedition, this time not against but in favour of Henry III. of France, 135.

Scheme for a Protestant League drawn up at a Diet at Plauen—Which princes were willing to join it—Petition of grievances from the Protestant Electors to the Emperor in 1590—Imperial decision, 135–139.

Dutch and Spaniards on the Rhine—Assembly of imperial deputies at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1590—Protestant League transactions at Torgau in 1591—Krell, chancellor of the Elector of Saxony, wants a Calvinistic emperor—An army under Christian of Anhalt for Henry of Navarre, 140–144.

Futile efforts for the formation of a Catholic League of Defence—Lutheran princes against the 'Calvinistic intrigues,' 144–148.

VII. Calvinism in Saxony and its Downfall—Method of Polemics between the Lutherans and the Calvinists in the North of the Empire—Collapse of the intended Protestant League 149

By what sort of means Chancellor Krell pushed on the spread of Calvinism since 1586—Opposition of the people—An 'admonition to the nobles'—The Calvinists dream of a golden century—Krell's hopes of complete victory, 149–157.

Downfall and imprisonment of Krell in 1591—All sorts of 'prodigies' and 'demoniacal apparitions'—Fury of the Saxon people against the Calvinists, 157–165.

A 'Peace sermon,' 166–167.

Fear of a general insurrection—Religious fanaticism in North Germany, 167–170.

The Administrator of the Saxon Electorate, Frederic William, in opposition to the Palatine revolutionary party—Death of John Casimir in 1592—A funeral oration—The Bishop of Strasburg on the hopes of the Catholics, 171–173.

VIII. The Strife in the Strasburg Chapter and the Consequences for Alsatia. 174

Suppression of the Catholics in Strasburg—The Calvinistic canons and the Lutheran preachers—The latter, in 1591,

CHAPTER PAGE

demand the extermination of the 'popish worship'—The treatment of nuns, 174–179.

The Strasburg bishopric question since 1592—Gruesome way in which the war was carried on—Treaty of 1593—Strasburg in a state of ruin, 180–183.

IX. The Turks allied with the Christian Powers against the House of Habsburg—Religious Transactions at Ratisbon in 1594 184

Impotence of the Emperor—Efforts of Popes Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V. for a general league against the Turks—Venice, England, and France in league with the Turks—Henry IV.'s declarations—The Turkish war of 1593–1594—The papal policy, 184–188.

Convocation of a Diet at Ratisbon—Saxony and Brandenburg willing to contribute Turkish aid, but not so the Palatinate—Machinations of the latter—Hopes of the Calvinistic agitator, Duplessis-Mornay—Position of the Catholics, 188–191.

Protestant grievances at the Diet—Counter-complaints of the Catholics—A Turkish subsidy voted—Protest of the majority of the Protestant Estates, 191–194.

X. Progress of the Turks since 1594—Negotiations for a Protestant League—Convocation of a fresh Diet in 1597 195

Fear of an invasion of the Turks in the Empire—'Sermons from the Turk'—The Turkish war of 1595—Capture of Erlau—A league against Spain—Protestant Union transactions at Amberg, 194–199.

The Emperor destitute of all help—The Administrator Frederic William on the position of affairs, 199–202.

XI. From the Transactions of the Diet at Ratisbon in 1598—Character Sketch of the Palatine Elector, Frederic IV. 203

The imperial proposition at Ratisbon—Which of the Estates declare the decisions of the majority to be unbinding—Calvinistic grievances—The Pope 'an anti-Christian tamperer with time'—The Catholics and the loyal Lutheran Estates in favour of decision by the majority—Strengthening of the revolutionary party—Its protest against the Imperial Recess, 203–212.

Frederic IV. 'head and director' of the party; his character shown by his diary and his account-book—What his court establishment cost, 212–217.

CHAPTER PAGE

XII. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE PALATINATE—INCREASING CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE CALVINISTS—EXECUTION OF THE CHANCELLOR KRELL IN 1601 218

Frederic IV. attempts to force the Palatinate into Calvinism—Risings of the people in Amberg and Hambach—Atrocities in Tirschenreuth—Demoralisation of the people, 218–220.

Results of a church visitation in 1596—The 'peace-hating' preachers—Popular rejoicing over Philip Nicolai's book making out that 'the devil is the god of the Calvinists'—The people of Zurich against Nicolai—The latter's answer—Nicolai's associates, 220–226.

Charges against Krell—An excellent description of an open and a secret Calvinist—Incidents at the execution of Krell—A funeral oration—Rooting out of Calvinism in Saxony, 226–233.

XIII. PAPAL ENDEAVOURS TO FORM A LEAGUE AGAINST THE TURKS—SPANIARDS AND DUTCHMEN IN THE EMPIRE—AN UNFORTUNATE EXECUTIVE EXPEDITION IN 1599—AN ENCROACHMENT ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE EMPIRE, 1600 234

The Turkish aids voted are not handed in to the Emperor—What Clement VIII. was compassing—Attitude of Henry IV. of France, 234–237.

Spaniards and Hollanders are lords on the Rhine—War horrors, 1597–1598—General Mendoza—Designs of the Palatine party, 237–242.

Frankfort Protestant Assembly, 1599—Project for a league to annihilate the House of Habsburg—The Catholics in dread of a universal war, 242–243.

A Turkish expedition and its disastrous issue—Henry IV. undaunted—Another Protestant assembly to be convoked, 243–248.

XIV. THE DISPUTE OVER THE FOUR CONVENTS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR THE EMPIRE, 1600–1601 249

Visitations of the Imperial Chamber—Decisions of the Imperial Chamber in the Four Convents case—Protestant jurists against the Protestant interpretation of the Religious Peace—Opinion of Leonard Schuz, 249–253.

Machinations of the Palatine party for the destruction of imperial justice—Decisions of the Palatine party at a Diet at Friedberg in 1601—Deputation to the Emperor, 253–263.

CHAPTER PAGE

Assembly of deputies at Spires in 1601 and its dissolution—Result of the dissolution, 263–268.

XV. The Turkish Danger and Palatine Policy—Negotiations concerning the Succession in the Empire—Hessian Negotiations with Frankfort in 1602 . 269

Turkish conquests—Powerlessness of the Emperor—John of Zweibrücken in favour of proceeding with armed force—A Diet at Friedberg in 1602—The Elector of Brandenburg withdraws from the revolution party, 269–273.

Mental illness of the Emperor—The Elector Palatine hopes for an interregnum—Interference of France—Maurice of Hesse forms a league with Henry IV.—His reports on the transactions with the King—Enters into French pay—Promises of Henry IV.—Attempts at a union—Position of the Elector Palatine, 273–284.

XVI. The Ratisbon Diet of 1603—The Success of the Revolutionary Party 285

Increased bitterness between the opposite parties in the Empire on account of the Four Convents dispute—Threats of the Elector Palatine—Instructions of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria—The Elector of Saxony on the side of the Catholics—By what means the dissolution of the Diet is averted—The spiritual members of the council of princes on the suppression of the Catholics, 285–293.

XVII. Catholic Attempts at Reform 294

Father Canisius the soul of the Jesuit Order in Germany—Protestant opinions about him—Memorandum on ecclesiastical affairs and the needs of Germany—Gregory XIII.'s services to the German Church—Establishment of nunciatures—What advice Canisius gave to the Pope and the General of the Order, Aquaviva—Principles of the German Jesuit leader and the means for the spread of the Order, 294–311.

Protestant opinions on the work of the Jesuits and on the reasons for their being respected by Protestants also, 311–312.

Fresh Jesuit colleges and gymnasia, and the increasing number of pupils in them—The spirit in which the instruction was imparted—Student unions connected with the Jesuit schools—The Marian Congregations and

CHAPTER PAGE

what they aimed at—Activity of the Jesuits in the national schools, 313–323.

The German College at Rome, and the devotion of the Germanikers in Germany—Opinion of a preacher, 323–329.

The charitable labours of the Jesuits—How Canisius exhorted and encouraged the members of the Order, 329–333.

New life in the old Orders—The labours of the Benedictines—The Carthusians and their chief representatives—The Franciscans and their martyrs—The spread of the Capuchins and their many-sided activity—Capuchins and Jesuits hold popular missions—An exhortation from Canisius, 333–347.

XVIII. TERRITORIES BROUGHT BACK TO THE OLD FAITH . . . 348

The right of Catholic rulers to carry on reform, 348.

Ecclesiastical conditions in the duchy of Jülich-Cleve-Berg—Means by which the progress of the Catholic faith was effected—An embassy of Protestant princes in Cleves and their explanation of the Religious Pacification—Why Duke William IV. opposed the 'freedom of the Augsburg Confession'—The young Duke John William 'very Jesuitically inclined'—A Jesuit school in Emmerich since 1592, 348–357.

Results of Catholic restoration in the bishopric of Münster—A Jesuit school in Münster since 1588—The Jesuits in the bishopric of Paderborn—The Prince-Bishop Theodore of Fürstenberg, 357–361.

Progress of the Catholic cause in South Germany; Bishop Julius of Würzburg one of the most zealous champions—His measures against the Protestants—Improvement of national education—The Julius hospital and other institutions, 361–369.

Labours of the Prince Abbot Balthasar of Fulda in the cause of Catholic restoration—The papal seminary, 369–371.

Catholic restoration in the bishopric of Bamberg under Bishop Philip of Gebsattel—The Fuggers found a college and a gymnasium for the Jesuits in 1582—Student and burgher congregations—The Easter communions—The University at Dillingen—Conversions, 372–375.

Ecclesiastical conditions in the bishopric of Bamberg under Bishop Philip of Gebsattel, and in the archbishopric of Salzburg under the Archbishops Wolf Dietrich and

CHAPTER PAGE

Marx Sittich—Measures against the Protestants—The Jesuit Scherer on Bishop Urban of Passau, 375–380.

Religious proceedings in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola—Archduke Charles and the Protestant nobles—The Bruck concessions and their withdrawal—A Jesuit university at Graz since 1585—The Archduchess Maria, 381–396.

Archduke Ferdinand at Ingolstadt—The Catholic restoration since 1597—Rigid measures adopted in consequence of the encroachments of the Protestants—Prince-bishop George Stobäus on these measures—Threats of the Protestant Estates at the provincial Diet at Graz in 1599—Ferdinand's 'capital resolution'—The land-marshal's protest, 396–409.

Procedure for Catholic restoration since 1599—Ferdinand's letter of self-justification to Maximilian of Bavaria—Proceedings of the Bishops of Seckau and von Laibach—The Jesuit schools—Protestant vituperations, 409–416.

XIX. Position of the Empire in 1603—The Imperial Court at Prague 417

Archduke Matthias on the dangerous state of affairs and how it was to be remedied—What the ecclesiastical Electors petition of the Emperor—Policy of the Elector John Schweikart of Mayence—The Emperor and the rule of valets at his court—The all-powerful Philip Lang, 417–422.

XX. The Calvinist Rebellion in Hungary and Transylvania, and the Revolutionary Party in the Empire, 1604–1606 423

Rule of the nobles in Hungary—Demands of the Calvinists in 1604—Imperial decree—Insurrection—Stephen Bocskay of Transylvania and the Turks—Fear of a general rising of the Protestants in the imperial hereditary lands—Peace treaties with Bocskay, and with the Turks in 1606—Stephen Illeshazy, 423–428.

How the Palatine party seeks to profit by the rebellion in Hungary and Transylvania—It hopes to secure Hungary for the Palatine House—Christian II. of Saxony—A report on the proceedings of Bocskay—How Frederic IV. of the Palatinate stirred up the Protestants against Rome and against the Jesuits—The Italian adventurer Brocardo Baronio—L ellous pamphlet of a Palatine court publisher—Summons s to a war of religion against the Catholics, 428–437.

CHAPTER PAGE
XXI. TRANSACTIONS CONCERNING A LEAGUE, 1606–1607. . . 438

The Emperor, the Elector of Mayence, and the Duke of Bavaria against the formation of a Catholic League—Palatine efforts for the regulation of the succession in the Empire; an understanding with Henry IV. of France—Secret treaty of the Austrian dukes—Henry IV. arranges a Protestant League—Franco-Palatine proceedings with a view to a union—Which princes shall be canvassed first, and how to gain the adhesion of the imperial cities, 438–446.

XXII. EVENTS AT DONAUWÖRTH UP TO THE YEAR 1608 . . . 447

Suppression of the Catholics in Donauwörth—The monastery of the Holy Cross—A public procession insulted—Decree of the Aulic Council against the town council—The Emperor in 1607 commissions Duke Maximilian of Bavaria to provide for unhindered exercise of the Catholic religion in the town—Arrival of the Bavarian Commissioners and fierce tumult—Report of the Commissioners. 447–457.

By the interference of the Protestant Estates the Donauwörth affair acquires universal significance—What Duke Maximilian demands from the Emperor—A second deputation of Bavarian Commissioners and their treatment—The town is laid under the ban and occupied by Bavarian troops—Memorandum of the Munich councillors concerning the proceedings against Protestant burghers—How Maximilian treats the Protestants—Results of the enforcement of the ban—Terrible rumours—Protestant wishes, 458–466.

XXIII. THE DIET AT RATISBON, 1608—DISSOLUTION OF THE DIET . 467

The Emperor demands Turkish subsidies—'Wonderful new tidings'—Agitation among the Protestants—Reports of the Brandenburg ambassadors—A letter of the Bishop of Ratisbon—What Pope Paul insists on—How far the Elector of Mayence will meet the views of the Protestants—A Palatine 'Instruction' and its significance, 467–476.

Attitude of the Elector of Saxony and reports of the Saxon ambassadors—What is advocated by a Heilbronner preacher in the public market-place, 476–479.

Transactions concerning the renewal of the Religious Pacification—Libellous books and pamphlets—A clause in the Religious Pacification insisted on by the Catholic

CHAPTER PAGE

Estates—The 'interposition document' of the imperial commissioner, Archduke Ferdinand—The latter's reports on Protestant demands, 479–488.

Reasons why the Palatine party tried to bring about the dissolution of the Diet—Attitude of the imperial cities—Declaration of the Protestant ambassadors and counter-declaration of the Catholic Estates, 479–498.

The Donauwörth affair, 498.

What is hoped by the Protestant side from the dissolution of the Diet—Demands of the revolutionary party through Archduke Matthias, 498–499.

XXIV. THE FRATERNAL QUARREL OF THE HOUSE OF HABSBURG—A PROTESTANT LEAGUE CONCLUDED 500

Origin of the breach between the Emperor and his brother Matthias—Matthias in league with the Calvinist party leaders in the imperial hereditary lands and with the Calvinists in the Empire—Military expedition against Rudolf II.—Rudolf's mental illness—Plans of Prince Christian of Anhalt—The Emperor cedes Austria, Hungary, and Moravia to Matthias—Transactions in Bohemia—Fruits of the rebellion of the Archduke, 500–512.

How the Protestant League in Ahausen came about—The League transactions and their significance—Position of the Empire about the middle of 1608—Theological controversy rampant, 512–523.

INDEX OF PLACES 525

INDEX OF PERSONS 533

Errata

Page 83, headline and lines 2[b] and 7[b], *for* Rothenburg *read* Rotenburg
„ 86, line 2[b] and note 1, *for* Rothenburg, *read* Rotenburg
„ 97, „ 14, *for* as in 1580, *read* as at Wittenberg in 1580
„ 130, „ 9, „ Eichfeld, *read* Eichsfeld
„ 170, „ 6[b], „ Kreuzheim, *read* Krenzheim
„ 175, „ 6[b], „ Winnenberg, *read* Winneberg
„ 185, „ 15, „ Betz, *read* Petz
„ 191, note 2, „ Courts, *read* Counts
„ 195, „ 3, „ Mangolt, *read* Mangold
„ 214, line 15, „ Landschaden, *read* Landschad
„ 215, „ 2, „ Schuy, *read* Schug
„ 261, „ 14[b], „ Obertorf, *read* Oberdorf
„ 269, „ 4, „ Kaniza, *read* Kanizsa
„ 273, note 3, line 11, *for* chamberlain, *read* valet
„ 310, line 3[b], *for* Migrinus, *read* Nigrinus
„ 328, „ 13[b], „ Denne, *read* Deune
„ 333, note 1, „ Exacten, *read* Exaeten
„ 335, line 11, „ William IV., *read* William V.
„ „ „ 7[b], „ Benditbenen, *read* Benediktbenem
„ 336, „ 4[b], „ Othmas, *read* Othmar
„ 338, „ 1, „ Abdingkosen, *read* Abdingkofen
„ 339, „ 10, „ Laurenz, *read* Laurentius
„ 346, „ 10, „ Rottenburg, *read* Rotenburg
„ 415, „ 6, „ Strigentius, *read* Strigenitius
„ 443, note 1, „ Klese, *read* Klesl
„ 473, line 1, „ Madruz, *read* Madruzzi
„ 478, „ 9, „ Neuberg, *read* Neuburg

HISTORY

OF

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

BOOK I

ADVANCING DISINTEGRATION OF THE EMPIRE AND GROWING SECTARIAN BITTERNESS UP TO THE FORMATION OF THE UNION IN 1608

CHAPTER I

CALVINISTIC SECULARISATION SCHEMES—PREPARATIONS FOR THE COLOGNE CATASTROPHE, 1581–1582

FROM the time of the death of the Elector Palatine Frederic III. Calvinism in Germany had been banished from political life, and zealous Calvinists had even come to fear utter extinction in consequence of a league between the Lutheran and the Catholic Estates, which seemed likely to be the result of the Formula of Concord. In April 1581 Count John of Nassau wrote to his brother William of Orange that it was the opinion of many that if the alliance planned between the

Lutherans and the papists became an accomplished fact, the reformed sects—*i.e.* the Calvinists and the Zwinglians—would either be subjected to the extremities of persecution ' or else might be in danger of sudden and complete extermination by a general massacre similar to those of St. Bartholomew and of the Knights Templars.' The Count derived some comfort from the fact that respect for the Book of Concord was continuously decreasing; the King of Denmark had intimated to the Landgrave of Hesse that if he signed the book he should consider him a scoundrel. On the other hand, the ' true religion ' was steadily taking deeper root.[1] ' The Calvinists,' wrote the jurist Viktorin Friedemann in December 1581, ' accuse the Concordists of open whoredom with the idolatrous papacy, and threaten to extirpate them, together with the papists; while, on the other hand, the Concordists, in their writings and speeches, are moving heaven and earth against the Sacramentarians. The animosity between the two parties is so intense that serious bloodshed is to be apprehended; even princely personages are no longer spared.' In Dresden a murderous plot—nominally Calvinistic—had been discovered against the Elector Augustus; in Hesse a Landgravine, decried as a Calvinist, had been seriously wounded by a nobleman in the service of the Lutheran Electress.[2]

The Count Palatine, John Casimir, who for years past had been the organising chief of a league of all the Calvinistic States, might be regarded as the political head of the German Calvinists. ' Giving vent to his

[1] In Groen van Prinsterer, vii. 538, 539.

[2] December 27, 1581, to Dr. Karl Hundhausen at Frankfort-on-the-Main. Concerning the episode in Hesse see Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* i. 814.

opinion on the affairs of the Empire' on one occasion in the year 1581, 'he said boldly, under the influence of drink and in the presence of one of the councillors of his Electoral Grace of Mayence, that no good could come as long as the priests and the religious foundations remained in existence; they should all be secularised; unrestricted freedom in religion should be established in all papistical territories, and the Empire should be recast in a fresh mould under an exemplary evangelical chief. Such a consummation was all the more likely to be achieved—provided all loyal hearts held firmly together—inasmuch as the power of the House of Austria was visibly becoming more and more disintegrated.' The Emperor 'had his hands full with the Turks, and with his own subjects almost on the verge of rebellion, and he would be powerless to check the reformers if only they set to work in good earnest to propagate the holy Evangel in the Popish bishoprics, beginning with those of the Rhine.' [1]

Similar hopes were cherished by the Count Palatine George Hans von Veldenz, who in June 1581 represented to John Casimir that, as there was a near prospect of the demise of Marquard von Hattstein, Bishop of Spires, the Palatine House ought to confiscate this bishopric, appoint an administrator, and institute freedom in religion. Part of the chapter and of the nobles, he believed, might be won over; but if the canons should not consent to the proceeding 'means were not wanting to prevent any lengthy dispute over the possession.' For the benefit of religious freedom they must make an

[1] In an exhaustive report on the Augsburg Diet of 1582, and some transactions preliminary to its meeting, by Winand Bechtold, an official of the Elector of Treves. (In my own possession.)

example of one of the bishoprics, 'or else,' he wrote, 'the priests will jeer at us and cast it in our teeth that we threaten mightily with letters but that we do nothing practical.' Christopher Ehem, former chancellor of the Elector Frederic III., and at the time being in the service of John Casimir, approved of the proposal, but considered it scarcely practicable. He said that Frederic had also busied himself with the matter, but had not even been able to get hold of the bishoprics of Sinsheim and Neuhausen. With regard to the bishopric of Spires, he himself, the chancellor, had once been sent to interview the bishop, and the latter had at first given him reason for hope, but had afterwards become very wavering. He advised, however, that George Hans should 'state his measures' and apply to Heidelberg for help from the Elector Ludwig; it would be necessary to impress on the nobles of Spires that the Saxon nobility had been well pleased with the confiscation of the Saxon bishoprics.[1] George Hans had had an eye to the appointment of his eldest son George Gustavus as administrator at Spires, and wanted simultaneously to raise him to the Electoral See of Treves. After the death of Archbishop James of Treves, which followed in June 1581, he explained to the cathedral chapter in detail the best means of solving 'the question of religious freedom'—viz. that the chapter were to nominate a 'potentate of the German nation' to be Archbishop and Elector. The individual members would receive in return, besides other financial benefits, a present of 10,000 florins.[2] John of Nassau, also, was engaged in comprehensive schemes for 'secularisation.'

In the Low Countries 'the godly undertakings of

[1] In v. Bezold, i. 442, 444.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 444, note to No. 297.

the House of Nassau were in very evil plight;' all means were, indeed, resorted to for the purpose of 'Calvinising' the provinces, but with meagre results. 'Among the States-General and the highest personages of the land,' Count John wrote to the Landgrave William of Hesse, on March 13, 1578, none besides William of Orange and the States of Holland and Zealand had as yet declared openly for 'the new religion' and shown a zealous interest in it; among the lower ranks, only 'here and there' some of the common people.[1] In April 1580 Count John complained to Count Ernest of Schauenburg that in the provinces there was nothing but war, discord, mistrüst, variance, and corruption. He and his brother William were no longer sure of their lives; they were so little supported that they often even wanted for bread on their table. John Casimir had undertaken a campaign to the Netherlands 'on behalf of the holy Evangel,' but had distinguished himself solely by plunder and devastation, so that in the year 1579 he was forced to leave the country covered with shame and derision.[2] Since this a complete

[1] In Groen van Prinsterer, vi. 311.

[2] The Count Palatine was ridiculed in comic songs, and in a 'Pasquillus Virgilianus' it was said of him—

Fœmineo prædæ et spoliorum ardebat amore,
Montes parturiere, est natus ridiculus mus.

The Saxon Elector's councillor Abraham Bock, who was staying at the court of Casimir's wife, wrote on March 1, 1579, to the Elector Augustus, 'The Count Palatine's men have come back in such a miserable and dilapidated condition that if one did not know who they were one might judge the greater number of them, from their clothes and general appearance, to be poor beggar-folk.' On April 5, 1579, John Casimir made the following promise to his mother-in-law, Anna of Saxony: 'I intend this summer time to return, like the prodigal son, for I have now had enough of devouring with the swine' (v. Bezold, i. 336 and 338, notes 2 and 3). Fuller details on his campaign in the Low Countries are given in Kervyn de

rupture had taken place between him and William of Orange. He and his councillors and theologians asserted that William had never been seriously concerned about religion, that he had had designs on the life, honour, and property of the Count Palatine, and that his one aim and object was 'to attain greatness and dominion.' [1]

The more desperate, however, things became in the Netherlands 'all the more vigorously must agitation be carried on in the Empire.'

With a view to the confiscation of the West German bishoprics and the organisation of an armed Calvinistic league, Count John worked assiduously to promote his brother Ludwig's earlier plan of a 'league of counts.' In November 1581 he was able to inform his brother that the scheme had made substantial progress. Relations had already been established with the Suabian and Franconian nobility; they were also in treaty with the nobles of Fulda, and they had reason to hope for the accession of some of the princes and towns; thus 'the best and largest part of the German nation would be gathered together;' the counts were disposed, under certain conditions, to 'make use of John Casimir as a leader of the confederated counts.' [2]

Gebhard Truchsess, Archbishop of Cologne, was destined to supply the impulse which would 'set the huge ball rolling and almost grind to atoms the whole following of the Roman Antichrist.'

The Archbishop of Cologne, Salentin of Isenburg, had at last, in September 1577, with the Pope's consent, fulfilled his long-standing intention of resigning

Lettenhove, v. 198 ff. '*On ne voit dans vos actes*,' the Englishman Davison wrote to him, '*que calamités, pilleries, sauvageries et dévastations*' (p. 286).

[1] Groen van Prinsterer, vii. 419. [2] *Ibid.* viii. 26–34.

his charge. Contrary to the wishes entertained at Rome and Munich that Duke Ernest of Bavaria might be his successor, Gebhard Truchsess of Waldburg was nominated to the vacant See; and, in spite of the efforts of the papal nuncio, Bartholomew Portia, to frustrate his candidature, he was elected Archbishop on December 5, 1577.[1] The Calvinistic members of the cathedral chapter, backed up by the exertions of the Calvinistic counts of the Wetterau—in particular of the archiepiscopal hereditary steward Count Hermann of Neuenar—had succeeded in turning the decision in favour of Gebhard. The latter, in order to obtain papal confirmation, solemnly assured the Pope that he would, 'as far as possible, faithfully perform all that was conducive to the maintenance of the true Catholic religion and to the restoration of the Church of God;' that he would 'aim and endeavour that your Holiness shall find me in no way wanting in anything that beseems a true and faithful archbishop labouring zealously for the dignity of the holy Apostolic See.' He received the higher orders, and in April 1578 he swore fidelity to the Tridentine confession of faith before the Archbishop of Treves, by whom, after taking the oath of an Elector, he was received with all due form into the College of Electors. The Emperor granted him the regalia, until such time as he should have obtained the papal confirmation.

Immediately after Gebhard's election the reformed religionists of Cologne had come forward with great assurance, and had protested against the Catholic worship, and insisted on freedom in the exercise of religion. Calvinists from the Low Countries poured into the town

[1] See *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xliii ff.

and preached publicly at three different places. The Archbishop, besieged by the cathedral chapter, by the University, and by the clergy, entered into negotiations with the burgomaster and the town council, in October 1578, as to the best measures to be taken against these preachers and against the spread of libellous pamphlets and ribald caricatures and the contempt of the Catholic sacraments. In December the town council issued a stringent order that 'Anabaptists are to be punished with death; Zwinglians and other Sacramentarians are to leave the town within three days, under penalty of forfeiture of life; all secret conventicles and all fresh leagues are forbidden; whosoever dares to blaspheme against the Blessed Mother of God, the sacraments, and the saints will be punished by torture.' In February 1579 the Emperor admonished the council to be resolute in the maintenance of the Catholic religion. On the other hand several Protestant princes complained of the oppression practised on their co-religionists, a number of whom had been expelled from the town or punished with money fines. To these complaints the magistrates returned answer that these people had not suffered punishment on account of their religious faith, but on account of holding forbidden conventicles and meetings, and that their punishment had been of a very mild description; moreover they, as magistrates of a Catholic town, were no more bound, according to the terms of the religious pacification, to tolerate the Augsburg Confession than were the Protestant princes to allow their Catholic subjects free exercise of their religion.

The statements of the witnesses examined by the papal nuncio Castagna, as also the observations made

by the Pope's own representative, were favourable for Gebhard Truchsess, who was accordingly confirmed as Archbishop of Cologne by Gregory XIII. in the consistory of February 29, 1580.[1] By his pretended enthusiasm for the Cologne Jesuits the new chief shepherd was admirably successful in producing the most favourable impression at the papal court,[2] where, until late in the year 1582, the Archbishop was still considered a loyal adherent of the Catholic Church. It was through a report of the cardinal legate Madruzzi from Innsbruck (June 6, 1582), on his way to the Diet of Augsburg, that the papal Secretary of State first received any unfavourable information concerning Gebhard's religious plans. At the Diet it was already openly stated in July that the Archbishop of Cologne intended to marry and to retain his archbishopric all the same.[3] Such, indeed, was the case. Gebhard Truchsess, who posed outwardly as a friend of the Jesuits, and who sent Catholic representatives to the Augsburg Diet, had inwardly completely broken with the Church, and was causing the greatest scandal among the people by his manner of life. 'It has long been whispered about,' says Hermann Weinsberg in his note-book, 'that the Elector is by no means exemplary as the master of a household, that he does not pay his councillors, his servants, or his debts; that he leads a dissolute, profligate life, entertains illicit relations with women; that

[1] Fuller details in Lossen, *Kölnischer Krieg*, pp. 467–675. See also Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch.* i. 566 ff., and *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xlvii ff., 290 ff.

[2] This was not the only matter in which Gebhard posed as a Catholic prince. Early in the summer of 1581 he admonished the Pope to bestir himself without delay for the election of a King of the Romans from the House of Austria, for otherwise a Protestant Emperor (the Elector of Saxony) would be chosen (Zöchbaur, i. 19).

[3] *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xlix–li, 313 ff., 316 ff.

he has engaged himself to a young Countess of Mansfeld, a canoness of Geresheim; and, further, that he has acted as a tyrannical despot in causing two or three men to be shot, stabbed, or otherwise put to death.' He is said to be of a capricious temper, 'now mildness itself, now savage with fury.' At Kaiserswerth Gebhard is said to have shot down a lacquey from a coach-box. This rumour is not quite authenticated, but the reports of his immoral conduct are undoubtedly true.[1] Among the women with whom Gebhard kept up amorous intercourse was Countess Agnes of Mansfeld, who became his concubine. The Countess's brothers, who for a considerable time had tolerated these shameful relations in silence, at length declared to the Elector that if he did not restore their sister to honour by a legal marriage they would deal out to him the severest vengeance. Under this pressure the Archbishop, in the presence of several witnesses, gave his promise on oath that he would renounce the archbishopric and return to a private condition, in order to be able to adopt the Augsburg Confession and marry Agnes.

But such a step was neither in accordance with the views of the Countess, who aspired to be an electoral princess, nor with those of the Calvinist revolutionary party and their plans for 'the propagation of the holy Evangel.' It would be far better, they said, for the Archbishop to 'retain his archbishopric, together with his electoral hat,' in spite of his change of religion and his marriage, and this for four reasons: first, a 'breach that could never again be closed up would

[1] Müller's *Zeitschr. für Kulturgesch.*, Jahrg. 1874, p. 752; Ennen, v. 30. '*Omnibus manifestum fieri incipiebat, quod in scortorum et concubinarum choro assiduus erat*' (*Ab Isselt*, p. 11). Lossen, ii. 33 ff.

thus, once for all, be introduced into the Ecclesiastical Reservation;' secondly, 'the long wished for freedom in religion would be an accomplished fact in one of the principal dioceses, and would easily be followed by similar freedom throughout the whole Empire;' thirdly, 'the majority of votes in the College of Electors would henceforth lie with the evangelical Estates,' and resulting from this, 'fourthly, and as the most essential outcome of the situation, at the next imperial election the papistical House of Austria would be excluded from the throne and an evangelical ruler would be secured.'

For all these reasons Gebhard had already, in 1580,[1] been earnestly solicited 'to persist boldly in his projected Christian work.' In November 1581 Count John of Nassau, commissioned by certain 'good-natured persons,' made inquiries of the Protestant Electors and other Estates, and also of his brother William of Orange and of the Netherlands, as to 'what manner of inducement it would be well to hold out to the Archbishop, who was inclined to marriage, in order the more easily to persuade him to the retention of his archbishopric.'[2]

In the following year also similar steps were taken to influence Gebhard.[3] His 'godly undertaking' was 'first and foremost to be supported' by extorting from the town council of Cologne free exercise of the Protestant religion. On the council's refusing to grant this Count Adolphus of Neuenar, in July 1582, again started public preaching by the Calvinist Ursinus in his castle at Mechtern. Numbers flocked from the town to

[1] See v. Bezold, ii. 2, note 5, and the letter of Archbishop Henry of Bremen, ii. 53, No. 66, note 1.

[2] *Instruktion des Grafen Johann für Philipp Engel, vom 28. November 1581*, in Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 34.

[3] v. Bezold, i. 463, 469.

hear these sermons. Count Adolphus and the Count of Bentheim brought with them several companies of cavalry, and the meetings assumed so threatening a character that the town council caused the muskets of the city walls to be directed at the assembly, and drove the preacher to flight.[1]

'The most active instigator' of the Archbishop was John Casimir, who was already busy recruiting in the spring of 1582, in order to come to Gebhard's help with an armed force. Simultaneously with the first blow struck for Gebhard the Prince of Condé was also to begin operations in France. The Count Palatine had represented to the latter that the Archbishop's scheme was of the utmost importance for France; it meant no less than the exclusion of the House of Austria in the election of a King of the Romans, and the gain of Gebhard's vote for a French candidate to the Crown.[2] In the month of August John Casimir sent the Count Palatine, John of Zweibrücken, to the Archbishop in order to move him to a 'good and valiant decision,' promising to equip an army for him at the expense of the Palatinate and the Rhenish circle, and to hasten in person to his defence, in order to preserve for him, and for the successors whom the Countess Agnes might bring him, the possession of the electoral principality of Cologne.[3]

Gebhard had long refused 'to bite' at baits of this kind, because he foresaw that he would be opposed by

[1] Ennen, v. 400 ff.; Lossen, ii. 44 ff. Gebhard was desirous that preaching should be started in Cologne also. 'I do not know, however,' wrote Count Herman Adolphus of Solms to John of Nassau, on July 9 1582, 'how it is to be managed' (v. Bezold, ii. 6, No. 6).

[2] La Huguerye, ii. 150–151, 184–185. See ii. 259, 262, 263, 267.

[3] *Ibid.* ii. 194.

a largely preponderating majority of the Cologne cathedral chapter, by the town of Cologne also, and by nearly the whole Rhenish district of the archbishopric. It was not till the summer that his decision was formed. On August 1 he betook himself to Westphalia, in order to win over to his schemes the Protestant nobility of that land, especially the young squires, eager for warfare, with whom he joined in dissolute revelries. He was assiduous in his attendance at the Catholic Church services, actually caused agreements to be contracted for the erection of a Jesuit school, and, in the presence of Catholics, deplored 'the assertion of his enemies that he intended to change his religion and to marry,' declaring that it was a gross calumny, and that he would rather lose his head than separate himself from the Catholic Church.[1] As early, however, as August 4 and 6 he made a statement of quite another kind to the Protestant Archbishop, Henry of Bremen, who was also Bishop of Paderborn. He told this prelate that he had come to see the errors of the papacy, and that his 'conscience compelled him to unite himself in marriage with a young lady of the rank of countess; his earlier intention of resigning his archbishopric had met with opposition from some of his relatives and friends, and so he had decided to go forward 'for the glory of God and the spread of His saving Word.' In adopting this course he had the consolation of knowing that his work was a holy one and well-pleasing to God—yea, verily, the work of God Himself. Without this comfort, indeed, he could not embark 'on so comprehensive, so important, so lofty, and altogether so difficult an undertaking;' for 'not only would he have against him

[1] Kleinsorgen, p. 292; Ab Isselt, pp. 160–161. See Pieler, p. 53.

nearly all the chief personages of the province, both lay and clerical, as well as the greater number of his nearer kindred,' but also the leading potentates of Christendom. He added that on him (the Archbishop Henry) he relied for the best human counsel and support, and was firmly convinced that the Archbishop, together with his blood relations and co-religionists, would lend him assistance 'in so just a cause.' He begged him especially to interest the Elector of Saxony in the matter.[1]

Notwithstanding that this business was transacted with the utmost secrecy, 'trustworthy rumours on the subject had already penetrated to the Diet' which the Emperor had opened at Augsburg on July 3, 1582, for consideration of a fresh Turkish subsidy and an invasion of the Low Countries.

[1] v. Bezold, i. 511–513.

CHAPTER II

TRANSACTIONS AT THE DIET OF AUGSBURG IN 1582

'WITH fear and trembling' the Catholics had looked forward to the new Augsburg Diet. Every possible lever, Duke William of Cleves informed Pope Gregory XIII. in March 1582, was being set in motion in order to extort at Augsburg an imperial decree for freedom of religion. Such a measure, however, would be the ruin of all ecclesiastical and secular order. He begged, therefore, that the Pope would make every effort by means of his legate to hinder 'this monstrous crime.'[1] 'It is much to be feared,' wrote the nuncio Francis Bonomi, in February, to Duke William V. of Bavaria, that the coming Diet 'will cause great injury to the Catholic religion, for the representatives of the heretics are many of them powerful personages, and they are intrepid into the bargain; whereas the Catholics have but few champions, and these few take the matter much more coolly than the gravity of the abuses and the impending dangers justify. And what shall I say concerning that timorousness which possesses the hearts of Catholics everywhere—even when there is no real cause for fear—and makes them quake and tremble? Their souls are, as it were, benumbed by some secret spell; and this is especially the case with those whose

[1] '. . . *ut is manibus et pedibus tam immane scelus avertere conetur*' (Theiner, iii. 312).

right, nay, whose duty it is to come forward as defenders and promoters of the Catholic faith. Either they do not foresee the impending ruin or else they await the final collapse with their hands folded idly in their laps.' [1] The impressions produced on the nuncio by a lengthened residence at the imperial court were of such a kind as to make him almost despair of human help. 'Unintermittently,' so he wrote from Vienna to the Archbishop of Prague on March 21, 'we must pray to God that He will Himself protect His own cause. I find that among the secular magnates the Catholics are very weak, and also—even when there is no cause for anxiety—full of nervous apprehension, not to speak of the half-hearted, undecided waverers, who are satisfied with the mere name of Catholics, and who do almost more damage to the Church of God than if they were avowed heretics.' [2]

After the opening of the Diet, at the very first session of the council of princes on July 6, 'a matter came up for settlement, which, if the Protestants,' wrote Winand Bechtold, an official of the Elector of Treves, 'had carried it through, would have utterly shattered the Ecclesiastical Reservation in the very presence of the Emperor and the Empire, and have completely established religious freedom.' 'But God in His mercy,' he continues, 'vouchsafed that the Catholics, strengthened by the legate of His Holiness,' the Cardinal Bishop Louis Madruzzi of Trent, 'stood firmly by each other and overthrew the cunningly manœuvred scheme.' [3]

[1] Bonomi, 'Epistolario,' 1582-1584, fol. 49, in the library at Blijenbeck in Holland.

[2] *Ibid.* fol. 81.

[3] In the report quoted at p. 3, note 1. For the publication of Ma-

The matter in question was the representation of the archbishopric of Magdeburg at the Diet.

The Margrave Joachim Frederic of Brandenburg, who had been appointed administrator at Magdeburg, would not renounce the privileges attached to former archbishops of the diocese, although he was a married man. He demanded for his ambassador not only a seat and a vote, but also the presidentship in the council of princes, while he himself was representing his father, John George of Brandenburg, on the Council of Electors. Now, since Albert of Brandenburg, Elector of Mayence and Archbishop of Magdeburg, had ceased to take part in the transactions of the council of princes, the presidency of this council had devolved on the Archbishop of Salzburg. Accordingly the plenipotentiary of Salzburg, the Bishop of Seckau, raised a protest against the pretensions of the Margrave's ambassador. He protested at the same time against the latter's participation in the council of princes, for the reason that the archbishopric at the time being had no authorised head confirmed by the Pope and invested with the regalia by the Emperor. To the ambassador's retort that his lord had been nominated to the administration in the regular manner, and that with regard to the regalia he had received repeated assurances from the Emperor, the Bishop attached so little importance that he left the assembly, declaring that he could no longer take part in the deliberations in the presence of this ambassador, who had the effrontery to intrude himself.

druzzi's interesting report on the transactions at the Augsburg Diet we are indebted to Hansen, *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 2, 371–572. The letters of the Cardinal on the apostasy of Gebhard Truchsess are printed in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 312 ff.

He referred the matter to the arbitration of the Emperor. It came to the ears of the Protestant Estates that the Catholic members of the council of princes had resolved that at their next meeting, if the said ambassador again attempted to take a seat, they would leave the hall in a body. In order to appease the strife the Emperor and the Electors of Mayence and Saxony proposed that the Administrator, Joachim Frederic, should be allowed a seat and a vote this time, but on condition that the privilege should not again be accorded him until he and his chapter had qualified themselves in the regular manner—that is to say, had obtained papal confirmation of the election. The Administrator was to be required to draw up an explicit *Revers* to this effect, and the document was to be signed by the Elector of Saxony.[1]

'Whereas the priests did not perceive,' it says in a report of a Protestant delegate, 'that the concession of a seat to the Administrator would open up the way for freedom of religion, the Pope's legate drew attention to this fact,' 'whereupon the ecclesiastical members decided that the Emperor must state in a declaration in his own handwriting that freedom of religion would not be the consequence of this action; otherwise they should all withdraw.' As, however, the Emperor had not been able to persuade the Administrator to desist from his demands, the Elector of Saxony had managed to bring about Joachim's departure, urging as a reason

[1] Häberlin, xii. 211–218; Ranke, *Zur deutschen Geschichte*, pp. 115–120; Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte*, i. 580 ff. H. Förster, *Der Magdeburgische Sessionsstreit, Breslauer Inaugural-Diss.* 1890, is unsatisfactory; see Lossen, 'Der Magdeburger Sessionsstreit auf dem Augsburger Reichstage von 1582,' in the *Abhandl. der hist. Kl. der bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Bd. 20, Abteil 3, p. 623 ff.

for his leaving that 'the towns had already set themselves in opposition to the Estates, and if they were joined by one even of the princes serious disturbances would ensue.' [1]

'If Magdeburg and his followers—among whom the Palatine party may specially be mentioned—had carried their point there would thenceforth,' wrote Winand Bechtold, 'have been very little question of papal confirmation of bishops and archbishops, and above all a good foundation would have been laid for the scheme of the Archbishop of Cologne, concerning whom much of all sorts was whispered at the Diet.' 'One of the Palatine counts' expressed himself as follows at a banquet: 'They need not be at such pains to carry on the struggle; there could be no question that, as in the north so along the whole of the Rhine, the papacy would be put an end to; thus it was written in the stars, and thus the initiated had long since prophesied; things, moreover, were now all pointing manifestly to such an issue.' [2]

The old demands 'for incorporating Ferdinand's Declaration in the Recess, for throwing bishoprics open to the counts, and for freedom of religion for the subjects of the Catholic princes' were brought forward again at this Diet by many of the Protestant Estates, headed by the Elector Palatine; they made the grant of the Turkish aid for which the Emperor asked, conditional on their stipulations being granted.

Nevertheless the Elector Augustus of Saxony 'was

[1] v. Bezold, i. 508–509.

[2] In the report quoted at p. 3, note 1. As early as May 1582 Count Herman Adolphus of Solms wrote to John of Nassau that there 'was great sorrow and much talk among the priests concerning the affair of Gebhard' (v. Bezold, ii. 3, note 2).

as little inclined then as at former Diets to associate himself with these claims of the confessionists.' Even before the opening of the Diet, when the Emperor had represented to him 'how much danger was involved in freedom of religion,' he had answered 'that he did not intend to promote it, but, on the contrary, that he should do all in his power to ward off innovations.'[1] In contradistinction to other Protestant Estates—especially the Elector Palatine, who did not wish for equality of creeds, but only demanded religious freedom for their own co-religionists—Augustus was of opinion that what was claimed for the Protestant subjects of Catholic rulers ought also to be granted to Catholics living under Protestant dominion. Accordingly in his instructions to his ambassadors he had pointed out that, 'even should it be possible to obtain complete, unconditional liberty in religious matters, we do not know but that we and our co-religionists may be forced in our own lands and territories to see and to tolerate, to a greater or less extent, the popish idolatry of Jesuits and Mass priests;' for this reason the question of religious freedom for evangelicals under ecclesiastical princes had better be left alone.[2] At a conference between the councillors of the Palatine Elector and those of the Elector of Brandenburg the Saxon councillors declared in plain language, on July 11, that 'religious liberty was contrary to the religious pacification;' the papists would say that they also wanted to protect their religion in evangelical districts; the Elector's interpretation of the religious pacification was that all ruling authorities might, in their own

[1] v. Bezold, i. 497, note 4.
[2] Ritter, *Augustus of Saxony*, pp. 361–362.

countries, set up whatever religion they pleased; if the subjects did not like it they might sell their goods and go away. The demand concerning the Declaration of Ferdinand was also to be given up, for it would be impossible to push the matter through. The ambassadors of the Elector of Brandenburg were of the same opinion with regard to this last matter. With regard to the question of religious liberty, the Protestants, it was to be feared, had 'themselves spoilt the game;' the clergy had 'concluded from their proceedings that they were standing out for their property.'[1] A resolution was agreed to unanimously that the demand for religious liberty was by no means to be given up altogether, but that it was to be waived during the present Diet; 'if, however, any of the Estates would like to reform their religion they should do so without disputing about it.'[2]

Among the general grievances brought forward by the Protestant Estates and discussed by the councillors of the Protestant Electors with the ecclesiastical Electors and their councillors three principal ones were described as 'reasons for highly pernicious mistrust.' The first was, 'none but Catholics were appointed by the Emperor to the offices of the Imperial Court of Justice and to imperial commissions;' the second, that 'in some of the Catholic imperial cities the adherents of the Augsburg Confession were excluded from the government and from public offices by special decrees of the town magistracy;' the third (and of this the nobles especially complained), that 'the Pope had imposed on ecclesiastical personages of the higher benefices "dangerous oaths" which were entirely

[1] v. Bezold, i. 495–496.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 508, note 2.

opposed to liberty of religion. Much evil might arise from this. There were in the Empire a number of ruined counts, nobles, and other indigent persons who would like nothing better than the beginning of a rebellious movement; they would throw themselves with their men-at-arms on those points where the situation was most dangerous. In Franconia especially the people were already astir, and if things came to an insurrection the ecclesiastical lords would presumably have little help to expect from their subjects, and even the evangelical Estates—if they should come to their help—would find it a hard matter to suppress the agitation. No warfare was ever fiercer or more dangerous than that waged under the pretext of religion, 'for the effect on the people was to make them readier to fight, fiercer in their rage, unwilling to spare parents, brothers, or any one else, and quite unamenable to reason. Experience had abundantly shown this in France and in the Low Countries.' Added to which many of the leading rulers in the Empire were coveting the Church property in their neighbourhood, and would not neglect such an opportunity for getting possession of it. At the same time foreign potentates would undoubtedly help to fan the conflagration and would profit by such civil disturbance to wrest from the Empire whatever suited them. The German nation would then be face to face with ruin, for there was no longer a powerful mediator, as the Emperor Ferdinand had been formerly, between the Estates of the different religions, so that the agitation and turmoil would not come to an end until one party had completely demolished the other. For this reason the petitioners begged the ecclesiastical Electors to use their influence

in favour of the following reforms: that the office of president of the Imperial Chamber be alternately represented by the different creeds; that the imperial commissaries be chosen from the members of both religions; that in the Catholic imperial cities the adherents of the Augsburg Confession should be admitted to posts of honour, and finally that the oppressive papal oaths should not be imposed on the higher beneficiaries.

To this petition the ecclesiastical Electors answered: 'They were willing to preserve brotherly friendship and a good understanding with the lay Electors, and they would not allow the slightest encroachment on the terms of the Religious Peace; but with the conditions proposed they could have nothing to do. The appointment of the president of the Imperial Chamber was the privilege of the Emperor by unanimous consent of the whole Empire; in the choice of his commissaries also his Majesty had a free hand; the appointment of councillors and public officials in the imperial cities rested with the ruling authorities in each different place, and they, the spiritual Electors, were not empowered to prescribe any rules in this matter; with regard to the oaths of the beneficiaries, these were still the same as of old: they did not know in what respect they had been made more burdensome or remodelled in opposition to the Religious Peace.' [1]

In justification of their demand that the Protestants in the Catholic imperial cities should be accorded free exercise of their religion, and should not be excluded from the municipal offices, the Protestant

[1] Lehmann, pp. 191–193; Hoffmann, i. 616–622. Cf. Häberlin, xii. 341–347.

imperial cities put forward a new explanation of the religious pacification. According to this treaty, they said, not only the Estates, but also their subjects were guaranteed security and tranquillity of conscience. It explicitly granted the free cities, as *immediate* Estates, the right to go over to the Augsburg Confession. Now it was not only the town council but also the burghers of the town who constituted the 'Estate,' and therefore the latter had equally the right to demand liberty in the exercise of the religion of the Augsburg Confession. The decrees issued in some of the towns, that none but Catholics were to be appointed to offices and dignities, were diametrically opposed to the Religious Peace, for a brand of ignominy was thereby cast on the Confessionists, and this was not to be tolerated.[1]

On the other hand the Catholic imperial cities made out that according to the Religious Peace they naturally possessed the same rights as the Protestant towns, and that the latter were not willing to allow any exercise of the Catholic religion, still less to admit Catholics to the municipal offices. In many towns even, where at the time that the Religious Peace was concluded Catholic worship still existed, it had been abolished in opposition to the plain letter of this peace. Nevertheless the Catholics in these towns did not indulge in any acts of violence, although they themselves were excluded from public office, deprived of the exercise of their religion, and actually punished if they attended divine worship in Catholic localities, or received the sacraments there. No one had a right to blame or hinder the Catholic towns for seeking to maintain

[1] Häberlin, xii. 380–384.

the unity of the Catholic Faith within their own walls. Their opponents wanted to prescribe to them rule and measure in their statutes, oaths, and conciliar ordinances; this, however, was in direct contradiction to the Religious Peace, which decreed that no one Estate should endeavour to bring round another, or the subjects thereof, to its own religion, or should grant refuge, protection, or defence to any subjects against their rulers. In the face of this clause they, the Catholics, were in many ways greatly oppressed and molested by the Protestant Estates. If ever a number of their citizens became disobedient and rebellious against the authorities, introduced fresh doctrines, set up conventicles, abused the rulers to other Estates, the Augsburg Confessionists were always instantly ready, either by writing or speech, to encourage and strengthen such turbulent people in their proceedings. They did everything they could to help the disaffected citizens in their efforts to subvert the municipal government and to weaken, and finally completely exterminate, the Catholic religion in the few remaining Catholic cities. Under the name of the Augsburg Confession this, that, or the other sect crept insidiously into these towns, multiplied their numbers from day to day, and, as soon as they felt they had got the upper hand, forced themselves into the government, began to set up their new religion, suppressed the old one, and drove the Catholics into misery. The truth of this was sufficiently shown in the States of the Netherlands and by the present troubles in Aix-la-Chapelle.[1]

[1] Lehmann, pp. 203–204. Cf. Häberlin, xii. 370–373. Concerning the proceedings at Aix-la-Chapelle see the statements of Ritter, founded

'The troubles in Aix-la-Chapelle' were a warning to the Catholics to arm themselves with special foresight.

The town of Aix-la-Chapelle, said the Emperor in repeated written statements, was raised to a royal city by Charlemagne and his successors in the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, and for the maintenance and propagation of the true old Catholic religion an important church and chapter were there founded and endowed, and set apart as the place where every elected king should receive his crown and consecration; he himself, after the example of his predecessors, had become a member of this chapter and had promised on oath to give it defence and protection. Under the Emperor Ferdinand, on March 7, 1560, this town had enacted the special decree, and had sworn perpetual observance of it, that burgomasters, sheriffs, and councillors should remain unswervingly in the Catholic religion, and should not admit adherents of any other faith to seats on the council or to civic offices.

Now, however, in consequence of the disturbances in the Netherlands, especially since the rule of Duke Alba, so many fugitives, Calvinists and Lutherans, had drifted into Aix-la-Chapelle that in the year 1574 a few Protestants, under promise to institute no change in religious matters, had been admitted to the town council. Soon after, in spite of their promise, the Calvinists and Lutherans had demanded open worship

partly on unprinted documents, *Deutsche Geschichte*, i. 221 ff., 556, 563 ff., 577 ff. See further v. Fürth, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aachener Patrizierfamilien*, Bd. ii. Bonn, 1882; Lossen, ii. 3 ff., 9 ff., and *Die Studien von Macco*; noticed in the *Hist. Zeitschr.* lxxxvii. 359.

and a church for themselves. On the council's refusing to grant their request they had set up preachers of their own who, the Catholics wrote, 'revile our faith before all the people as an abominable service of idolatry and an invention of the Devil.' Between the old inhabitants and the Calvinist new-comers discord and hatred had increased from year to year. Vainly did the town council forbid public preaching, and equally fruitless were the efforts of the Duke of Jülich, the lord protector of the town, and of the Bishop of Liege, its ordinary, to bring back into operation the ordinance of 1560. In November 1580 imperial commissioners had been sent to enforce the observance of this ordinance, but, owing to the opposition of the Protestant members of the council, the commissioners were obliged to leave without having effected anything.

In May 1581, by invitation of the bench of magistrates and a majority of the burghers, the commissioners returned, and it was decided that at the next election of the council none but Catholics should be appointed, and that all innovations should be abolished. The Protestant members of the council, however, set up two candidates against the two burgomasters chosen by the Catholics and the commissioners. The commissioners repudiated the Protestant candidates, and for prevention of further commotion they demanded the keys of the town in the presence of the assembled council. Thereupon the Protestants raised 'a tremendous uproar, rang the alarm bell, broke open the arsenal, dragged all the big artillery into the market-place, and armed the populace. They then proceeded to garrison the city gates, the towers, and the walls,

and compelled the burgomaster in office to deliver up the keys of the gates and the seal of the council.

'Under no slight shower of ridicule,' wrote the Emperor, 'our commissioners were again obliged to take their departure.'[1] Many of the leading burghers, councillors, and clergy left the town with them, and thenceforth the Protestants had the entire government in their own hands. In a mandate of June 21 the Emperor reproached the latter for their unwarrantable behaviour, promising, however, to forgive all that had happened if, within the space of six weeks, they should have obeyed his previous orders, recalled the banished inhabitants, and deposed the strange preachers —fugitives from other countries escaping from the punishment of crime.[2] Thereupon the Protestant council published an edict granting freedom of religion to the Catholics also, and guaranteeing the exiles full security for their return; further than this, the Emperor was informed, they could not go on obeying his orders without bringing ruin on the town. To enable them to carry on the defence of their proceedings the council made various appeals for help to their co-confessionists, at the same time laying all the blame of the Aix-la-Chapelle misdoings on the 'peace-hating' Catholics. The town riot was simply the result of natural and legitimate fear, and of the measures which it had been necessary to take for bringing town councillors and other refractory citizens into agreement with the bench and reducing them to submission, for rendering the council secure in its administration and position,

[1] *Warhafter und beständiger Bericht*, on which the Aix-la-Chapelle affair is originally and chiefly based (1613), pp. 9–15; *Kaiserlicher Bericht* in Hoffmann, pp. 418–421.

[2] Häberlin, ii. 358 ff.

and for putting a stop to discord and division. It was useless for the enemy to appeal to the ordinance of 1560, for the then existing council had not power to enter into any agreement on oath in opposition to the Religious Peace; it was open moreover to the council later on to alter the statute, just as the engagement made by the town of Hagenau to persist in the Catholic religion had not hindered it from changing its faith.[1]

Meanwhile the town of Aix-la-Chapelle, after 'all imperial mandates had been scattered to the wind,' was attacked by the Duke of Jülich and the Bishop of Liege and closely surrounded. On January 19 the Emperor issued instructions that the intended execution was not to be proceeded with until the arrival of his commissioners; but the meetings fixed by the latter for settlement of the question did not come to pass.

The council, although further heavily pressed by Spanish-Burgundian troops, persisted in its resistance, succeeded in raising the blockade by dint of successful sallies of its troops, and imposed unheard of taxes on the burghers for the maintenance of foreign soldiers.[2]

The Aix-la-Chapelle affair had acquired general significance for the Empire through the declaration of the Protestant imperial cities that it was 'a matter which concerned them all collectively,' and at the Augsburg Diet they made 'their whole procedure and all their concessions' dependent on its settlement. 'The verdict on Aix-la-Chapelle,' all the town delegates declared, 'must once for all determine, for all the imperial cities, that whenever a certain proportion of the municipal authorities and of the inhabitants had

[1] Häberlin, xii. 414–430. [2] *Ibid.* xi. 534 ff. and xii. 408 ff.

come to recognise the Divine Word the towns should be as free as the princes to change their religion, notwithstanding any number of oaths, statutes, and ordinances, dating from a period of papal blindness, which might stand in their way.[1] The Emperor had not sent notice of the Diet to the town of Aix-la-Chapelle, whose 'intruded council, rebellious against every highest command, could not be regarded as a regular legitimate magistracy;' and to the delegates who had made their appearance unsummoned he had refused any share in the transactions. In spite of this the towns received these delegates in their midst and accorded them seats and votes. In a written statement, handed in to the Electors and princes on July 19 by the town delegates, the latter condemned the Emperor's action against Aix-la-Chapelle most severely. They said that without previous legitimate trial he had decreed the execution of the ban against the town, a thing unheard of before in the Empire. He had declared in plain language that the towns were not Estates of the Empire nor included in the religious pacification; 'an attempt had been made at the imperial court to introduce the novel proceeding of excluding the imperial towns from State transactions without trial at law.' Unless they received the assurance that they would be guaranteed the benefit of the Religious and the Public Peace, as well as their seats and votes in the Empire, that illegal sentences of the ban and other damaging lawsuits would be removed, and that they would be allowed the same freedom and privileges as the Electors, princes, and Estates of the realm, they should act in accordance with the orders they had received not to let themselves

[1] Report of Winand Bechtold; see above, p. 3, note 1.

be induced to join in any deliberations, still less to assent to any concessions.

Rudolf, to whom this document was presented by the Upper Colleges, replied as follows: 'It was not according to the traditions of the Empire that a King of the Romans should give account to the towns of his mode of government and his official transactions. In order, however, to prove to the other Estates how great was the injustice of this charge made by the towns, he would give an account of the whole course of action of the people of Aix-la-Chapelle. His own measures had been entirely consonant with the constitution and the statutes of the Empire, and had had for their object the maintenance of the religious foundations and ordinances of his forefathers, as well as the privileges of the town. Those persons, on the contrary, who had arrogated to themselves the municipal government had gone to the utmost extremes of disobedience to and contempt of the Emperor, and had fully deserved to be deprived of all their rights. But, in whatever way the Aix-la-Chapelle affair might finally be settled, the towns had no reason whatever to withdraw from the general deliberations. It was a dangerous matter for one town, or one Estate, if it did not at once get its own way, to seek to make common cause with all the others, and to presume to defy the commands of the highest authority, to denounce that authority in disparaging language, to protest and appeal against its decisions, and to separate itself from the general affairs of the State, from its councils and its decrees.' [1]

But the town delegates reiterated that 'all their

[1] Hoffmann, pp. 413–418; Theiner, iii. 315–316; Häberlin, xii. 80–85.

complaints were well grounded; they had not been able to express themselves more mildly in their statement. What had happened to the town of Aix-la-Chapelle might in the future happen to any other town, and neither the profane nor the religious peace would be of the slightest use to the towns if they could be excluded in this sort of manner from their Estate and deprived of their seats and votes in the Empire. The Electors and princes were advised, at the present Diet, to pass a pragmatic sanction to the effect that 'no Estate of the Empire must henceforth be oppressed by commissions, decrees, or injunctions, in opposition to the Religious Peace and the Public Peace. If the Emperor thought that any given town or Estate had shown itself disobedient, and was deserving of punishment, he must first of all adopt the regular method of the law, and cause such town or Estate to be convicted; decrees and commands issued without proper legal steps should be considered unbinding and powerless, and should not be carried out by anybody; anyone who should enforce them by violence would fall under sentence of the ban.[1]

The towns stuck 'stiffly and starchly' to their declaration that until their grievances had been redressed they would not vote any subsidies. When at last the Emperor, after lengthy deliberations, obtained from the majority a grant of forty 'Roman months' as a Turkish aid, the towns entered a formal protest and expressly 'commended their standing grievances to their lords and masters.'

The towns were 'specially supported in their opposition' by the Protestant minority of the Council

[1] Hoffmann, pp. 458–466; Häberlin, xii. 450–459.

of Princes, above all by the ambassadors of the Count Palatine John Casimir, who were the leaders *par excellence* of the Protestant opposition party at the Diet. 'It seemed to be the great object at Augsburg,' wrote Winand Bechtold, to gather together in one great 'bundle' or league all among the princes, counts, inferior nobles, and towns who were disobedient, refractory, or inclined to insurrection, and John Casimir was the chief leader and promoter of all these plots and conspiracies.' 'If things went according to his and his fellow-conspirators' will, everything in the Holy Empire, Lutheran no less than Catholic, would be suppressed to make room for that bloodthirsty Calvinism; every single ecclesiastical benefice and foundation would be handed over to the Calvinists, and a Calvinist head forced on the Empire.' 'God grant,' Bechtold concludes, 'that all peace- and honour-loving people may league themselves together against such like conspiracies and schemes, for if these were to come to maturity, and take on the semblance of religion and German freedom, an unfathomable sea of blood would be the result, and very little would be left of the Holy Empire of the German nation; and then woe, woe unto us, and three times woe to those who are born after us.' [1]

Bechtold was not ill informed.

While John Casimir was chosen as the head of the league of Counts and the leader of their revolutionary schemes he was also to be the chief of a general Protestant league of towns.

On August 10 he wrote to his chancellor, Ehem, one of his representatives at the Diet, that in a talk

[1] See above, p. 3, note 1.

over the grievances of the towns with the imperial councillor Count Julius of Salm he had impressed upon the latter 'that the towns were of no slight importance to the Holy Empire, and that if no help was afforded them, and they should perchance league themselves together and choose a leader from their own midst, great injury might accrue therefrom to the Empire.' The Count had answered briefly 'that he believed we should be able to supply the towns with a good leader, which remark we heard in silence, answering nothing.'

Ehem wrote back on August 27 that there was a 'general outrcy at the Diet concerning this conversation; that it did take place, and several have reproached me with it. People are allowed to believe in it, and the thing may well come to pass.'

On August 14 he had already reported that 'all the secular princes and the towns attached to our religion have approved of our action, and are standing by us, which is a great thorn in the flesh to the papists. We are engaged in a secret transaction, which it would not do to write about at present, but which will be highly to your princely grace's advantage.'

On September 17 he expressed the wish that the business relating to the imperial towns should be proceeded with, 'whatever be the final result—for which we have made good preparations and laid good foundations.' On the Protestant side it was hoped that 'the cause of the towns and that of the counts might be joined in one.'

Count John of Nassau reckoned also in the matter on support from the Netherlands.[1]

[1] See his letter to the Prince of Orange, February 11–12, 1583, in Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 152.

In 1581 the insurgent provinces in the Low Countries had elected the Duke of Alençon, brother of the French King Henry III., 'as their prince and lord' after he had signed a special treaty surrendering Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht to Prince William of Orange.[1] In August of the same year the Duke had taken possession of the bishopric and town of Cambrai, and received there the homage of the inhabitants; in February 1582 he was inaugurated as Duke of Brabant. The Estates of Liege and Stavelot represented to the Diet of Augsburg that it was to be feared that the Duke of Alençon, after the nature and manner of the French, would advance further and further and extend French territory as far as to the Rhine. This probability had, indeed, already been hinted at in some newly published books, which spoke of the old French frontier between the Meuse and the Rhine as the best part of the Holy Empire.[2]

By the Emperor's wish the affairs of the Netherlands and the question of Turkish aid were to be the principal subjects of discussion at the Diet. Rudolf had given a detailed account of numerous and lengthy deliberations which his father, Maximilian, and he himself had carried on in order to put an end to the disturbances in the Low Countries, and had shown how injurious these disturbances were to the Empire, and how necessary it had become to take serious steps for retaining the Burgundian Circle in obedience to the Empire and to its legitimate rulers.[3]

Nevertheless the majority of the Estates 'would scarcely agree to anything.' Whereas timely attention,

[1] Cf. Holzwarth, iii. 487.
[2] Ennen. v. 35.
[3] Häberlin, xii. 102–113.

Duke Julius of Brunswick said in his instructions to his ambassadors, had not been bestowed on the Netherlands there was now little hope left of being able to wrest the provinces from the hands of the French. 'For Metz, Toul, Verdun, and other considerable slices cut off from the Empire sufficiently attest that what the crown of France has once got into its clutches it is able to keep. France will use all her strength and energy to prevent so powerful a province from being taken away from her again. We must commend the matter to God, and only see to it that nothing more is taken from us.' [1]

The Estates replied to the Emperor that it was undoubtedly 'a disastrous and dangerous example' which the Netherlanders were setting in deserting their rightful ruler and going over to a foreign one; it was also grievous that the States-General should have intrigued to surrender the town and bishopric of Cambrai to the Duke of Alençon. Nevertheless, under present circumstances, and for the avoidance of greater danger, they could not deem it advisable or practical to associate themselves in any way with such a war. There was only one course they could suggest, viz. that the Emperor should depute commissaries to the Spanish Stadholder, Duke Alexander of Parma, to insist that he should cease from oppressing and molesting the neighbouring Circles and States. True the Duke was not the sole offender in this respect, for these said Circles and States also suffered much injury

[1] Häberlin, xiii. xlvii–xlix. Fuller details concerning the transactions at this Diet in J. Müller, 'Richtpunkte und Ziele der äusseren Politik Deutschlands zur Zeit des Augsb. Reichstags v. J. 1582,' in the *Zeitschr. des Hist. Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg*, xxi. (Augsburg, 1894), 19 ff.

and intolerable oppression from the troops of the States-General; but to send a deputation to the latter would only serve to compromise the dignity of the Emperor, as no redress worth speaking of was likely to be obtained from them or from the Duke of Alençon. It would be well for the defence of the molested Circle to levy among the other Circles a contribution of two 'Roman months,' and to send a written injunction to the States-General admonishing them to remove the blockades by which, in violation of all international rights, they had intercepted free passage and navigation on the Rhine.

An injunction of this sort was to be the only resistance against the Dutch, through whose instrumentality German trade, formerly free and unchecked towards the open sea, had been bound with heavy fetters! Henceforth, so the Electors of Mayence and Treves urged, Germany would only be able to pursue commerce with the consent of Holland.

It was in vain that the Emperor reiterated his entreaty to the Estates to take the urgent affairs of the Netherlands into consideration 'with somewhat greater zeal and earnestness,' and to guarantee ways and means for preserving the provinces in the possession of the Empire. It was in vain that he reminded the Assembly that not only were these Provinces an integral Circle of the Empire, taxed double the amount of an electorate, but that some of their principalities, counties, lordships, and towns were especially bound up with the Empire and the House of Austria by fiefs and other links, and that therefore the Estates of the Empire had derived great commercial profit from these lands so long as they had

remained in submission to their rightful sovereign. He urged that great surprise would be felt everywhere, and that both within and without the Empire much disparaging talk would be occasioned, if after such lengthy deliberations nothing further was resolved upon than to admonish the ruling authorities of these lands not to molest the neighbour States with their troops; while, at the same time, the foreign invader was to be suffered, without striking a blow, without cost or trouble, under the very eye of the Emperor and the Empire, not only to bring the Burgundian Circle under his rule, but also to oppress the neighbouring States and towns with perfect immunity. If no notice was taken of the criminal action of the Dutch against their rightful lord, if Germany looked on in silence while a foreign prince was taking possession of whole provinces belonging to the Empire, the result would inevitably be, in these dangerous times, 'when nothing almost was any longer considered wrong or excessive,' that 'in other directions also, first here, then there, slices of the Empire would by degrees be cut off, and complete ruin of all orderly government would ensue.' 'In the name of German freedom' money and men were now being supplied to the foes of the Empire and to its rebellious subjects; against proceedings of this sort, at any rate, serious measures should be adopted.[1]

John Casimir's delegates reported as follows concerning the transactions on August 8: 'Although it was, generally speaking, quite impossible and impracticable to exert any weighty influence over affairs, a stand was nevertheless made against an edict which

[1] Hoffmann, p. 508 ff.

the papists attempted to pass through, according to which all those Germans who had already attached themselves to the Duke of Alençon were to be recalled, and none were in future to be allowed to join him. Against this measure we on the bench of lay princes set ourselves vehemently, and we have no intention of giving in, however much the ecclesiastical members may outnumber us. We hope for the support of the Electors—albeit they are somewhat divided among themselves—and above all for that of the towns.' [1]

'With regard to the Netherlands nothing was carried through,' not even the edict wished for by the Emperor. The Catholic majority in the Council of Princes made a fruitless effort to institute forcible proceedings against the Duke of Alençon. The Archbishop of Salzburg's representative gave a picture of the lamentable manner in which the Empire was hemmed in between the Franco-Dutch power and the Turks. 'The Swiss also,' he said, 'will surround us, and finally wrest the sceptre from our Empire.' The Frenchman, he said, had always held with the Turks against Charles V., and all the same he wanted to be called 'Christianissimus;' 'Turcissimus' would be a more suitable name for him.' [2]

They ought to insist that the King of France should recall his brother from the Netherlands, and

[1] v. Bezold, i. 514–515.

[2] Concerning the friendship between the French and the Turks the Venetian ambassador Paolo Contarini wrote from Constantinople in the year 1583: 'Colla Maestà Christianissima conserva il Signor Turco buona amicizia per due respetti, principalmente perchè con l' amicizia di quel re viene quel Serenissimo Signore ad assicurarsi in certo modo che tra' Christiani *non segua unione importante contro di lui*, e perchè per l' amicizia di quella Maestà vien di tempo in tempo *avvisato di tutto quello che si tratta nella Christianità*' (Albèri, Ser. iii. vol. iii. p. 244).

in case of the Duke's refusing to obey, should exclude him from the succession.[1]

The Emperor and the Catholic Estates were all the more embittered against the Duke of Alençon because of a report from a Bavarian agent at Cologne that he was in friendly relations with the rebellious town of Aix-la-Chapelle, and was endeavouring to foster the agitation there; he had promised the inhabitants, through an ambassador, that the lilies would not fail them even if the eagle did.

John Casimir also, so this report said, had promised the town military succour in case of need.[2]

John Casimir had still greater intrigues on foot.

'Poland is seeking a quarrel with the Emperor,' he says in his memoirs of 1582, 'and if the Emperor were to shut his eyes Hungary would fall away; the Bohemians are a standing difficulty.' Between King Stephen Bathori of Poland and his brother the Voyvode of Transylvania plans were being shaped for wresting the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia from the House of Habsburg, and on July 24 John Casimir instructed his representatives at the Diet 'to consult with other Protestant delegates as to the possibility of getting into relations with Hungary—said to be already disaffected — and with Transylvania; likewise to

[1] v. Bezold, i. 516. Henry III. protested that he had nothing to do with his brother's proceedings; he was a friend of Spain (v. Bezold, i. 559). On the other hand, on December 11, 1580, the Prince of Orange caused Count John of Nassau to be informed that the Duke of Alençon had now written, for the second time, not only to him, but also to the States-General that 'his brother, the King, was quite satisfied with his course of action, and had promised him all brotherly help and succour against the King of Spain' (Groen van Prinsterer, vii. 447).

[2] v. Bezold, i. 559.

deliberate with them if, and how, peace with the Turks could be secured.' [1]

There were hopes of gaining other confederates. The Protestant lords and country gentlemen of the Austrian hereditary dominions, always full of complaints of religious oppression, had sent their delegates to the Diet. These also were accredited to Casimir. 'The people of Austria, Carniola, and Carinthia are malcontent,' said the Count Palatine in his notes; 'it will be necessary to find another head or to have an interregnum.' [2]

'The affair of Cologne' was to be 'the right stepping-stone to everything that was necessary in the Empire.' John Casimir, after promising the Archbishop Gebhard in August 1582 his entire support, conceived the idea that the latter ought 'to resign the bishopric in his favour,' [3] and the arch-agitator Duplessis-Mornay expressed the hope in January 1583 that by means of the Cologne affair they might succeed in dispossessing the House of Austria, and elevating the Calvinistic King Henry of Navarre to the imperial throne.[4]

[1] v. Bezold, i. 555, 560, note 23.
[2] *v. Ibid.* i. 556, 561, note 24.
[3] *v. Ibid.* i. 557.
[4] Duplessis-Mornay, ii. 216–217

CHAPTER III

THE COLOGNE WAR AND THE CONTEMPLATED EXTIRPATION OF THE PAPACY, 1582–1584

After long wavering the Archbishop Gebhard of Cologne had finally decided to set on foot his 'godly, Christian work,' which was 'a work of God Himself.' He now plunged into it head over ears, without the necessary and proper preparation, and withal 'in an almost daily state of intoxication.' In October 1582, at an interview at Gesecke with the Protestant Archbishop Henry of Bremen, he entered into more detailed agreements, drew up all sorts of military regulations, and gave orders to his Westphalian councillors to follow Henry's instructions, and in case of need to throw open to him the electoral castles in Westphalia.[1] Henry, however, as he wrote to the Elector Augustus of Saxony, out of fear for his own country, 'did not wish to appear as director of Gebhard's enterprise,' but rather to let those act who, years ago, had already bound themselves *ex professo* to act.'[2]

At the beginning of November Gebhard returned from Westphalia to the Rhine, and before openly going over to Protestantism he purposed making himself master of the principal places in the archbishopric, first and foremost the town of Bonn, whence he would be able, he thought, with greater facility to subjugate

[1] Pieler, p. 55; Lossen, ii. 57. [2] v. Bezold, ii. 53, No. 66, note 1.

the upper and lower diocese. He pushed on rapid preparations under the pretext that the western frontiers of the Empire were threatened by foreign armies, those of Spain and France especially; it was incumbent on him to protect them. 'The dance has already begun,' he wrote to Count Albert of Nassau on November 19; 'I am now at work garrisoning my houses and towns, and endeavouring by various means to make myself master of those not yet in my possession; and all goes on under another semblance, although the rogues will not believe everything. Now, however, that the cat has been belled I must have the necessary assistance; I lack nothing but gold, and a very trifling amount would help me out of my need.' [1] He threatened the town of Bonn with an armed attack, and this menace, coupled with a letter forged in the name of the Cologne Cathedral chapter, frightened the town council into delivering up the town keys on December 22. He then proceeded to occupy the defence works with his troops, caused the gold and silver vessels and other valuables belonging to the bishopric to be removed from the Castle of Brühl, and mortgaged part of them in order to levy mercenaries and to defray the expenses of his extravagant court.

Happy and tranquil in mind, however, he certainly was not. Often at meals he would sit pale and speechless in the midst of his unruly warriors, without eating a morsel; he often drowned his qualms of conscience 'by such excessive drinking that he would fall on the ground in a state of intoxication.' [2]

[1] Ennen, v. 52–53. 'The die is cast,' he said two days later in a letter to Count John of Nassau; 'there is no more turning back' (v. Bezold, ii. 20).

[2] Letter of a councillor of the Elector of Mayence from Bonn, December 27, 1582. Cf. Pieler, p. 56. Concerning Gebhard's profligate life at

In the latter half of December he resolved to make a public declaration of faith. After writing to Duke Louis of Würtemberg on December 16 that 'for the present he did not intend to introduce any general reformation, but at first only to grant general freedom of worship and to proceed by degrees with the complete Protestantisation of the archbishopric,'[1] on December 19 he issued an edict full of hypocritical assurances. He said that 'whereas God in His mercy had led him out of the darkness of the papacy into the true light and to the recognition of His holy, saving Word, he desired nothing more ardently than to devote his life to his sacred office and vocation with a good and tranquil conscience, and to be the means of guaranteeing to his loyal subjects the free and public exercise of the true and unfalsified doctrine, and the legitimate use of the sacraments. He had no intention, however, of coercing any man's conscience, but, in accordance with the terms of the religious pacification of Augsburg, he would allow free exercise of both religions. By this means he should protect the archbishopric in its rights and liberties, and in no way infringe the electoral rights of the cathedral chapter, so that at his death, or in the possible event of his resignation of office, the choice of a new archbishop would rest incontestably with the chapter.'[2]

Shortly before this, on December 17, Pope Gre-

Bonn see v. Bezold, ii. 52, note 1. Dohna says in his autobiography of his stay at Bonn, 'I found matters there in a strange state, but nothing was less observable than any fear of God, or zeal to promote divine truth' (v. Bezold, ii. 50; Lossen, ii. 100).

[1] Ennen, v. 63.

[2] First published at Bonn on December 25 and 26, 1582 (v. Bezold, ii. 34).

gory XIII., in a mild and fatherly letter, had reminded him of his former oath, and warned him against taking any step which might separate him from the Church and plunge the archbishopric and the whole Empire into the worst confusion.[1] Gebhard answered that he had convinced himself by close and accurate investigation that the Roman Church had fallen away from the old Apostolic Church, and he had therefore been moved to follow the Word of God and throw in his lot with the pure doctrine; the oath that he had sworn to the Pope was illegitimate and not binding, for it clashed with his baptismal covenant and was opposed to good morality; equally unbinding was the prohibition of marriage among priests, which was contrary to Holy Scripture, to the Church Fathers, and to canonical right, and which had encountered much opposition; he hoped that the Pope would accept this his defence in a kindly spirit, that he would give no heed to flatterers, and would restore the Roman Church to its ancient dignity by means of necessary reforms.[2]

Gebhard's proceeding caused the greatest sensation both in Germany and outside. If the plan of this undutiful prince of the Church succeeded it would be scarcely possible to foresee the consequences. 'It is the universal opinion,' Minutio Minucci had already written to the Cardinal Secretary of State from Coblentz in January 1583, 'that on the issue of this monstrous business hangs either the maintenance or the complete downfall of the Catholic religion in

[1] Theiner, iii. 320. See pp. 321–323. Moreover the possibility of Gebhard's resignation had already, at that time, been taken into consideration at Rome. See *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, liii.

[2] Gebhard's written document and *Beilagen*, No. 9, pp. 68–75.

Germany.'[1] At the papal court the full bearings of the question were at once recognised, and the matter was taken up with great confidence and decision. Since doubt concerning Gebhard's apostasy had become impossible all relations with him were broken off at Rome, and the Vatican succeeded in guiding the imperial policy into a decided course. That the archbishopric of Cologne was preserved to the Church is due in the first instance to the resolution shown by Rome.[2] Only secondarily can this result be attributed to the intervention of Duke William of Bavaria and the Cologne cathedral chapter; all the same the services of these latter in the Catholic cause were very great.

From the moment that it was decisively settled that Gebhard intended to assert himself as Archbishop of Cologne, in spite of his change of religion, the cathedral canons, with but few exceptions, made a bold and resolute stand against him. Under the leadership of the Chorepiscopus (Assistant Bishop), Duke Frederic of Sachsen-Lauenburg, the chapter summoned the counts, the knights, and the towns of the archbishopric to a provincial Diet at Cologne for consideration of the question whether Gebhard was still to be regarded as territorial lord in spite of his change of religion, or whether it should be declared that he had forfeited the sovereignty, and obedience be withdrawn from him. Most of the Protestant princes sent plenipotentiaries to this Diet, in order to dissuade the Estates from the views of the chapter,

[1] *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 375. Cf. p. 489, the report of Cesare dell' Arena.

[2] *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, lxiv ff.

and also to gain over the chapter itself either by cajolery or by threats.[1] The Protestant Electors addressed a petition to the Emperor begging that he would in no way hinder the Archbishop in his Christian work, for Gebhard only wished to follow the dictates of his conscience, and to promote the glory of God and religious toleration, in no way whatever to suppress the Catholic religion. But the Emperor did not let himself be caught by fine-sounding words; on January 16, 1583, he enjoined the Chorepiscopus not to desist from his opposition to Gebhard, but to stand up unflinchingly for the maintenance of the Catholic faith in the archbishopric. The imperial and papal ambassadors and delegates of the Stadholder of the Netherlands, of Alexander of Parma, and of Duke William of Jülich-Cleves were energetic at the meeting in their endeavours to bring about a decisive resolution. Alexander, through Count Charles of Aremberg, guaranteed military help to the chapter and the provincial Diet.

The chapter laid the case before the Estates. Gebhard, they said, had levied troops of cavalry and infantry far exceeding the regulation number, and with these he had invested Bonn and other places; he had violated the treaty of the hereditary lands by placing foreign soldiers in the fortress of Kaiserswerth. In opposition to the fundamental constitutions of the land and the election capitulation to which he had pledged himself by oath he had not only adopted the Augsburg Confession himself, but also allowed his subjects to conform to it; and finally he intended to

[1] Ennen, v. 66; the chapter's letter to the Pope, January 26, 1583; Theiner, iii. 388.

enter into the state of matrimony. The chapter had repeatedly called on him to abolish all the innovations, but it was all in vain. In a case of this sort the Estates had the right, and were in duty bound, according to the ancient statutes of the land, to release the subjects from the oath they had sworn to their prince, and to place them under the authority of the chapter. Added to which it was enjoined by the Religious Peace that a prince of the Church who apostatised from the Catholic religion must at once renounce his bishopric or archbishopric, and that the chapter of the diocese was then at liberty to proceed to a fresh election.

The Rhenish provincial Estates, counts, knights, and towns declared themselves in agreement with the proceedings of the chapter, and they intimated to the Archbishop, on February 2, 1583, that if he would not desist from his illegal unconstitutional innovations he would find them on the side of that party which was minded to protect the statutes of the land. With the tacit consent of the Estates the chapter then instructed the Assistant Bishop to receive the oaths of obedience from the towns of the archbishopric, and with sword in hand to defend the rights of the land against the revolutionary assaults of Gebhard.[1] The former Elector of Cologne, Salentin of Isenburg, came forward as a valiant champion of these rights.

Among the Protestant princes, on whose support Gebhard counted, it was a matter of great moment whether, in changing his religion, he intended to join the Lutheran or the Calvinistic faith. The Count Palatine, John Casimir, insisted that the archbishop must without further circumlocution declare in favour

[1] Ennen, v. 71 ff. Cf. Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch.* i. 592 ff.

of Calvinism, or else he would not give him any help; he would not 'mount on horseback in order to establish the Confession of Augsburg, which, if he could, he would altogether change in Germany.' [1]

To people of Calvinistic opinions Gebhard, in private conversations, had spoken in such a manner as to make them think he held the same views as they did. But, as John Casimir's councillor La Huguerye emphatically declared, if at the present moment he expressed himself openly in favour of Calvinism he would get no support from the princes of the Augsburg Confession. The Count Palatine ought to be content for the present with a secret, written and sealed assurance from the Archbishop that as soon as his enterprise had succeeded he would introduce the confession of faith approved of by Casimir.[2]

Some of the Calvinist preachers from the Low Countries urged on Count John of Nassau the importance of making Gebhard 'introduce the right and true faith, not the ubiquist or Lutheran religion;' otherwise the secular war would be followed by an ecclesiastical one. The preacher John Fontanus insisted that good Dutch preachers must go to Cologne; the Archbishop must not be allowed to set up 'an empire of Solomon,' in which, 'side by side with the Church of God, the Devil's Church was also tolerated.' [3]

While Gebhard was promising the Calvinists, 'on

[1] '. . . qu'il ne vouldroit monter à cheval pour establir ceste confession, laquelle s'il pouvait il changeroit du tout en Allemagne' (La Huguerye, ii. 243).

[2] '. . . que tost après son establissement il feroit une déclaration de pareille confession qu'il désiroit, comme plusieurs autres ont faict et font tous les jours' (La Huguerye, ii. 244).

[3] Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 172, 240–241. Cf. viii. 193.

his soul's salvation,' that in a short time they should be allowed to have a church in Cologne,[1] in his letters to Lutheran princes he was expressing himself as a decided opponent of Zwinglianism and Calvinism, which he pronounced to be 'contrary to the Word of God.' He could not, however, he wrote to Duke Louis of Würtemberg, begin at once 'to put these down side by side with the extirpation of the popish abomination.'[2]

To the Count Palatine Philip Louis of Neuburg he complained, on December 18, 1582, of 'the damnable Satan,' who 'through peace-hating and obnoxious persons' had spread about that 'he was attached to the Calvinistic religion, and willing to establish it in the archbishopric.'[3]

John Casimir, who, after the example of his father Frederic III., invariably appealed in all public documents to the Augsburg Confession, and who derived his Calvinistic doctrine from the 'right and true expositions' in this creed, could not in any way take umbrage at a new religious edict issued by Gebhard on January 16, 1583, declaring that he sanctioned throughout his whole electorate 'public preaching and the use of the sacraments according to the contents of divine, prophetic, and Apostolic Scripture, and of the Augsburg Confession and its Christian definitions, founded on Holy Scripture.' It was the advancement of God's glory, the Archbishop said in his edict, which alone he had at

[1] Dohna's report from Bonn (December 25, 1582) to John Casimir (v. Bezold, ii. 37–38).

[2] Letter of December 16, 1582 (v. Bezold, ii. 32–33). Cf. Gebhard's assurances to the delegate of Duke Louis (Ennen, v. 39).

[3] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, p. 269, note 16.

heart, not his own profit, glory, renown, and splendour.' [1]

Meanwhile he held magnificent, extravagant feasts at his court at Bonn, using for his household alone 260 horses, and he left all the cares of government to Count Adolphus of Neuenar, whom he appointed his commander-in-chief and lieutenant on February 2, 1583. On this same day he solemnised his marriage with the Countess Agnes, and he left Bonn with his bride immediately after the wedding banquet, as he feared a surprise of the town by a detachment of troops of the Count of Aremberg.[2] In search of 'greater security' he fled first to Dillenburg, and then to Arnsberg. He smuggled away with him part of the archives and of the silver plate belonging to the archbishopric, and another portion was taken by the Count of Neuenar to one of his castles.

On February 10 Gebhard wrote from Arnsberg to the Duke of Würtemberg that 'Satan was setting himself in good earnest against this godly work, but that God would defend His own glory against all the powers of hell.[3] He also paraded before the Emperor, in a letter of March 19, 'the glory of God,' for the sake of

[1] Gebhard's 'Ausschreiben,' &c., *Beilagen*, No. 15, pp. 90–94; *Altes und Neues aus dem Schatz theologischer Wissenschaften*, 1701, pp. 465–472. Cf. Häberlin, xiii. 48, note.

[2] Superintendent Pantaleon Candidus, of Zweibrücken, officiated at the marriage. The certificate of marriage may be read in Moser, *Patriotisches Archiv*, xii. 189–191. Cf. v. Bezold, ii. 74, No. 92, note 1. Peter Hess, who held office at the Prince-Electoral court, wrote, 'Sponsa in copulatione et prandio tanquam re bene gesta fuit satis lasciva;' that her sister, on the contrary, wept (Ennen, v. 83). See also *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 411; Lossen, ii. 165 ff.; and Kaiser, two contemporary reports on the marriage of Gebhard Truchsess, in *Korrespondenzblatt der Westdeutschen Zeitschrift*, 1899, p. 134 ff.

[3] Ennen, v. 83–84.

which he was obliged to retain his land and people. His very marriage even was in accordance with the divine ordinance. The ecclesiastical reservation, which the Emperor pretended was part of the Religious Peace, had been obtained by the ruse of the Catholic Estates, and was not binding on him (Gebhard), for the Estates of the Augsburg Confession had persistently protested against it. He hoped, therefore, that Rudolf would strictly charge the Cologne cathedral chapter, above all the Chorepiscopus, not to oppose him, the Archbishop, in any way in his Christian undertaking and in the administration of his archbishopric, but rather to grant him full restitution, and to abstain henceforth from all manner of criminal sedition; otherwise, for the sake of his dignity and his conscience, he should feel compelled to resort to other means, and to turn for support to the Estates of the Augsburg Confession.[1]

On January 2 Gebhard had already applied to the town council of Strasburg, where he was also dean of the chapter, asking them to help in his 'godly work,' and to call on other imperial towns and on the Zwinglian cantons of Switzerland to give him their support.[2]

The Duke of Alençon's proffered help he did not intend to avail himself of, so the Landgrave William of Hesse was informed, unless he was abandoned by the Protestant Electors and princes.[3]

[1] Gebhard's 'Ausschreiben,' &c., *Beilagen*, No. 31, pp. 201–211. Moser's judgment on Gebhard is altogether admirable: 'This luxurious hypocrite did his utmost to cheat God, the Pope, the Emperor, the Empire, his friends, and his kinsfolk—but most of all himself' (*Patriotisches Archiv*, xii. 175).

[2] 'Schriften und Handlungen in Sachen des Kölner Erzbischop Gebhard,' in the Frankfort archives (*Folioband*, 'bei den Reichssachen von 1582'), ff. 18–21.

[3] Cf. v. Bezold, ii. 46.

William of Hesse set no great hopes on the Cologne enterprise. As for Gebhard's religious declaration, the Landgrave wrote on January 9, if the Archbishop had been a good Ahitophel, and had really wanted to advance religion, 'it would have been quite time enough two years hence.' 'Such great matters,' he said to Count John of Nassau, on February 22, 'cannot be set on foot with so little forethought and preparation; more is required for a dance than a pair of shoes, as the old adage says.'[1] To his brother Louis, who appealed to him on behalf of the Archbishop, William answered, on February 23, with a complete refusal, saying that it was not worth while to violate the Religious Peace for the sake of Gebhard, and to begin a civil war.

Among the Protestant Estates, he said, there was 'unfortunately so much division that if we were to combine together there would be more fear of our fighting each other than the enemy.'[2]

At a provincial assembly of the Cologne electoral duchy of Westphalia, opened in March 1583, the delegates from seventeen towns declared that these towns intended to remain true to the Catholic religion, and to protect themselves against all innovations and changes. At Arnsberg itself only four or five burghers declared themselves for the new religion. 'From several of the nobles, some of whom it must be confessed were almost too tipsy to stand upright, Truchsess received the solemn promise that they would stand by him in his undertaking, and place their lives and property at his

[1] Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 165: 'It is indeed lamentable that *tam pulchræ fabellæ tam præcox datus fuerit actor.*'

[2] *Zeitschr. des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, iii. 257; v. Bezold, ii. 54, note 1.

service.'[1] By means of all sorts of artifices and threats the opposition of the older councillors was nullified, and a recess passed by the assembly on March 15, in which Gebhard was congratulated that God had led him into the right way, and that the burdensome constraint on unhappy consciences would now be removed. The provincial Estates would promise him becoming obedience and support. At the same time, however, the adherents of the papacy should not be oppressed on account of their religion, but allowed the same freedom of conscience as the Protestants.[2]

Nevertheless forcible suppression of the Catholics began forthwith. Priests, monks, and nuns who would not go over to the new faith were driven out of the country; strange preachers took possession of the churches; plunder and desecration of all sorts proclaimed a reawakening of religious zeal. 'The whole county of Arnsberg,' wrote the Archbishop's councillor, Gerhard Kleinsorgen, 'was more and more at the mercy of soldiers, and for several months the poor inhabitants were so grievously burdened, oppressed, and ruined that they were obliged to submit to the will of Truchsess. Nevertheless through the worst of their misery and oppression the greater number remained staunch to the Catholic religion.'[3] Another contemporary reports that 'side by side with the excessive, almost bestial drinking of Truchsess and his wild boon companions iconoclasm was their almost daily pursuit.'[4] 'The manner in which Gebhard and his lawless troopers,' the preacher

[1] Kleinsorgen, pp. 41, 54.

[2] Häberlin, xiii. 174 ff.

[3] Kleinsorgen, p. 103.

[4] Letter of the Arnsberg 'Doctor' (*Magister*) Peter Endemann, July 17, 1583.

Ulrich Melber complains, 'carouse in churches and monasteries, and tyrannise over the poor people, is more than Turkish, and all evangelicals must in their hearts be ashamed of it.' [1]

The monastery of Wedinghausen, for instance, was completely ransacked, the church stormed, and all that was in it destroyed. Gebhard himself advised one of the monks 'to take to himself a handsome wife, and to go over to the Augsburg Confession.' The rector of the school at Werl, who had stood firmly by his faith, was thrown into a deep dungeon and maltreated by the soldiers. The whole of Werl was Catholic. At the Easter festival of the year 1583 there were still as many as from twelve to thirteen hundred communicants. All the same Gebhard, in spite of his promise of freedom of worship, forbade the Catholic Church service to be held; and everywhere else in the land he carried on the same gruesome proceedings against the Catholics. The inhabitants of the district of Bilstein complained that Gebhard's cavalry and infantry 'had driven them from their homes and acres, had broken open their chests and coffers, killed their cattle, stabbed, wounded, and shot numbers of people, carried away on their carts money, corn, and other articles of sustenance, and household utensils—in short, had behaved as though they were open and declared enemies. Many thousands of gold gulden would not repair the damage they had done.' The Countess Agnes also showed herself worthy of 'her bridegroom.' 'At Attendorn,' writes Kleinsorgen, 'Truchsess and his young wife drank the whole day long in a lordly manner, and at night they danced together in the churchyard, made the mining folk sing

[1] Letter of Aug. 27, 1583; in my own possession.

the most indecent songs to them, and themselves joined in the singing. Accompanied by the superintendent Kaspar Mothäus, whom he had himself appointed, and by numbers of other people, he forced his way into the church at Attendorn; the ruffianly band knocked in pieces the altars and images, and Gebhard himself seized an iron hammer and with several violent blows smashed up an altar stone.' Agnes hated altars and images. In one village church near Werl not only were the pictures destroyed, but Mothäus actually broke up the tabernacle and caused the Sacred Host to be trampled under foot. In Meschede also all the pictures were destroyed and the Hosts desecrated. 'The best accomplices of Truchsess in these outrageous proceedings were the bastard von der Recke and Johann Dinckelmann, the first of whom administered such an unmerciful thrashing to a bookkeeper at Werl that the poor man died shortly after; the other murdered his own brother Michael.' 'On August 11 Truchsess saw a beautiful crucifix standing in the churchyard at Werl, and he said to one of the soldiers, "Here, my good fellow, just go and give it a stab, and if it bleeds bring the blood to me;" and then he gave imperative orders that the crucifix should be taken away from the churchyard. At Wockelum, on August 17, he caused the mansion of the bailiff (*Drost*) Hermann von Hatzfeld to be set on fire, and himself did all he could, in a state of wildest frenzy, to feed the conflagration. He made the peasants swear to him that they would put to death all persons who either performed the sacrifice of the Mass or attended it. Where, I ask, was liberty of worship in all this?'[1]

[1] Kleinsorgen, xxxvii. 128–165; Ab Isselt, pp. 283–292, 306–308.

Everywhere in the land the plundered inhabitants had to submit to the hardest obligations.[1] The gold and silver treasures stolen from the churches were turned by Gebhard into thalers stamped with the inscription, 'At last the good cause triumphs.'[2]

Gebhard's 'so called works of God were verily of a strange nature.' 'No day ever passed,' says a report, 'on which he did not get drunk once at least; oftenest it happened several times a day, and to the manner of his cursing and swearing while in a state of intoxication many who were about him have testified with much horror.'[3] 'In Westphalia, as well as at Bonn,' says Kleinsorgen, 'Truchsess and his brother Charles, as well as the soldiers they have with them, gave themselves up to immoderate drinking, and they behaved so disgracefully, setting altogether at naught time, decency, and dignity, that the dullest of mankind have found it hard, in sight of such debauchery and hateful goings on, to believe in the vaunted wisdom and sincerity of Gebhard's schemes or in his so called high enlightenment.'[4]

On April 1, 1583, the Pope had excommunicated the Archbishop as an avowed heretic and a faithless rebel against the Holy See, had deposed him from his archbishopric and all his other dignities, benefices, and offices, and had called on the cathedral chapter to make choice of another archbishop.[5] The Pope's hopes with

[1] Kleinsorgen, pp. 251–255; cf. p. 103.

[2] 'Tandem bona causa triumphat' (Kleinsorgen, pp. 167–168).

[3] In the letter of Peter Endemann, quoted above, p. 54, note 4. July 17, 1583.

[4] Kleinsorgen, p. 11; cf. Pieler, p. 53.

[5] Theiner, iii. 392–394. Cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 473, 480 ff.; Lossen, ii. 251 ff.

regard to this choice were directed to Duke Ernest of Bavaria, then Bishop of Freising, Hildesheim, and Liege, who had before been a candidate for the archbishopric, but had been defeated by his competitor Gebhard.[1] Now, however, in view of the dangerous condition of affairs, Ernest had 'little desire to plunge into such a sea of troubles and overwhelming difficulties.' It was only by the urgent entreaties of the Emperor and the earnest advice of his mother and brothers and sisters that he was prevailed on to betake himself from Freising to Cologne. He was not only wanting in courage and energy, but he lacked also 'the lofty moral purity which is above all essential in a bishop.' Having entered the ecclesiastical estate against his inclination, Ernest lived after the manner of most of the lay princes of his time. He was an ardent huntsman, very susceptible to the pleasures of the table, and inclined to drink; he also kept a concubine.[2] A veritable tragedy it was for the Church in Germany, we read in several letters of Jesuits, that in times of so great danger no worthier head could be found for the holy city of Cologne.[3]

[1] See above, pp. 6, 7.

[2] For his character see Lossen, *Kölnischer Krieg*, the passages marked in the register at p. 762; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 324–333.

[3] As early as 1566 Canisius entertained no favourable opinion of the Duke. It was quite against the grain, he says in a letter to Borgia, dated July 6, 1566, and only under pressure from the Duke's councillors, that he had recommended him for a prelacy. Concerning Ernest's immoral conduct see below, p. 90, note. Archbishop Ernest on one occasion allowed himself to be so far carried away by anger as to threaten the nuncio Frangipani to break with the Roman See. It was in every respect a happy event when, after many fruitless solicitations, he was finally prevailed on to relegate the governance of the diocese to his nephew Ferdinand, whom he installed as coadjutor with the right of succession. See Unkel in the *Hist. Jahrbuch*, 1887, viii. 245 ff.

On May 23, 1583, Duke Ernest was elected Archbishop.[1] Very soon, however, the difficulty of his task began to appear so great that he bethought him of beating a retreat. In opposing the warfare on the Rhine, which had been kindled by Gebhard's troops, he did not meet with the support which he had expected from the Estates. 'Our adversary, the apostate,' he wrote, 'gets as much help as he wants in men and money from France, from England, from the Netherlands, and from several Protestant princes. We, on the contrary, are left without support in our enterprise. Spain, it is true, has sent us men, but they do us more harm than good.'

The Spanish troops committed deeds of violence of every description in the archbishopric. 'The Prince of Parma would, indeed, gladly do his best, but he is obliged, like us, to connive at things because the money for payment is not forthcoming.' The cathedral chapter, he said, was ready to raise 40,000 florins and to give a written bond as pledge, but, owing to the danger of the situation, no one would lend money on the security of the public tolls or of Church property. Besides all the munition and garrison expenses, 30,000 florins a month was required for payment of the troops. 'If, therefore, help does not speedily reach us,' Ernest wrote, 'we cannot tell but that we may be again forced to abandon the archbishopric.' He begged the Duke to send him at least 50,000 crowns.

William sent over immediately 20,000 florins, and promised to advance the cathedral chapter 100,000 florins in all; more than this he could not possibly do, on account of his own heavy burden of debts. All his

[1] Cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, lxiii ff; Lossen, ii. 258 ff.

endeavours, he said, to obtain money contributions from the rest of the Catholic Estates had hitherto been fruitless. 'No one will do anything; each waits for the other, and the end of it will be that we shall all be ruined.'[1] The Elector of Mayence, Wolfgang von Dalberg, was kept back from active procedure by fear of his Palatine neighbour. The Elector of Treves by no means hurried himself. Bishop Julius of Würzburg, on the other hand, took up a decided attitude in favour of the Catholic cause, and granted loans and contributions.[2] The only way of averting the Cologne crisis, so the Cardinal Bishop Louis Madruzzi of Trent had written to Duke William before the beginning of the war, was either to organise a new league or else to extend the Landsberg League to Nether Germany. The Duke, by virtue of his relations to Cleves, Liege, and Münster, might bring this into effect; he would be able also to reckon on those among the Protestant princes to whom the tranquillity of the Empire and the stability of law were dearer than the greed and covetousness of a few innovators; he would do well to solicit the Pope's encouragement of such a plan.[3] Not one of these hopes met with fulfilment. The Pope alone made any important contributions in money.[4]

From the House of Austria, which was jealously watching the growth of the Bavarian House, little was to be expected. Gebhard's adherents purposely set about the report that Bavaria was striving after the

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 262–265.

[2] Lossen, *Die angeblichen Protestantischen Neigungen des Bischofs Julius*, pp. 360–362.

[3] v. Bezold, ii. 37.

[4] v. Aretin, p. 266, note 11; Theiner, iii. 489, 499; Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch.* i. 608, and *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 607.

electorate of Cologne, with the intention of one day obtaining the imperial crown.[1]

Gebhard's most zealous supporters were the princes of the Palatine House. At the instigation of the Elector Louis an assembly of Protestant Estates was convened at Worms, and on March 24, 1583, the members declared themselves willing to grant a contribution of eight 'Roman months' and to appoint the Count Palatine John Casimir commander of the troops which should be levied with this money.[2] The Count Palatine sent a memorandum to the Estates explaining to them 'what sort of an attempt' against the freedom of Germany the Roman See had in mind. Backed up by the Emperor, and in full understanding with the Rhenish bishops, the Pope intended, by means of this war, to give the Duke of Parma, whom he had appointed as executor of his designs, an opportunity for extending the frontiers of the Netherlands as far as to the Rhine. 'I brought forward so many weighty reasons in proof of this,' writes John Casimir's councillor, La Huguerye, who had been commissioned to draw up the memorandum, 'that the Protestant princes who received copies of the document were thoroughly roused up, and they promised the Elector of Cologne that if the troops of the Rhenish Circle commanded by John Casimir were not sufficient they would allow those of the neighbouring Circle also to join his standard, and they would place every means at his disposal for the successful issue of his enterprise.'[3] In

[1] Cf. Häberlin, xv. xxxii, and v. Bezold, *Rudolf II. und die heilige Liga*, p. 355 ff.

[2] v. Aretin, p. 257.

[3] . . . 'Ce que je fei avec si pregnantes raisons et considérations que en ayant esté envoyé coppies à tous les princes protestants, *ils eurent*

order to get the Protestant princes well under way the plan was formed at the court of the Count Palatine to allow for letting the Spanish troops of the Duke of Parma advance unchecked on the Rhine, and the town of Cologne actually fall into their hands. By this means Cologne, on the one hand, would be punished for taking part against Gebhard, and on the other hand the princes and imperial towns would bestir themselves to reconquer the town from the Spaniards, and would pursue them still further, according as things turned out. The Netherlanders, also, would attain the object of their wishes—viz. 'to arm Germany against Spain.' [1]

John Casimir's activity was at fever heat. He applied for money help to the imperial cities, to the Queen of England, to the King of Denmark,[2] and endeavoured in April to persuade the Duke of Bouillon also to take part in the war. He intimated to the latter that the Duke of Jülich-Cleves had no sons and was ill. If he died during the war Bouillon might establish a claim to right of succession to these duchies, and he might reckon on his (the Count Palatine's) support in such an attempt.[3] Strasburg and other Alsatian towns and Spires promised John Casimir help, hoping also that the war might 'free Aix-la-Chapelle from its state of oppression.' Frankfort-on-the-Main, on the other hand, sent in a refusal on April 25.[4]

la puce en l'oreille; et, oultre les assurances qu'ils avaient jà donné aud. s[r] electeur de Cologne de le maintenir, ils promirent aussy que si les forces du cercle du Rhin, conduites par led. s[r] duc Casimir, ne suffisaient, ilz le feraient suivre des cercles voisins et fortifier de telle sorte qu'il auroit moyen de venir à bout de cette entreprise.'

[1] La Huguerye, ii. 241.

[2] Letter of April 1583, in the 'Schriften und Handlungen in Sachen des Erzbischofs Gebhard,' fol. 53 ff.

[3] La Huguerye, ii. 220 ff.

[4] 'Schriften und Handlungen,' fol. 58–78, 81–83.

John Casimir's activity was equalled by that of his brother the Elector Louis. The deposed Archbishop had called on him at Heidelberg on April 3, and Louis had made him fresh promises of powerful support, and on April 8 had required the cathedral chapter of Cologne to reinstate him, saying that the Electors would 'recognise him only, and no other, and that in case of non-compliance they would indemnify themselves for all damages and expenses.' Gebhard 'was to be supported with the regular troops of the Rhenish Circle.' On April 10 Louis applied to the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg for contributions towards levying troops 'on behalf of this most important, most Christian, and most righteous cause.' He begged that they would respond cheerfully and willingly 'for the glory of God and the propagation of His Word and kingdom.' [1]

The Elector of Saxony, however, no longer considered Gebhard's cause righteous, and spoke out against the proposed military succour. It was true that formerly, so he acknowledged at the end of March 1583 to the Electors of the Palatinate and of Brandenburg, he had addressed himself on Gebhard's behalf to the Cologne chapter and to the Emperor, but he had done so under the hope that the Archbishop would have 'laid a good foundation for his work among the greater number of his subjects, and would at least have made so far sure of them as to know that they would not be antagonistic to his schemes.' Things, however, had turned out very differently. The Rhenish provincial Estates had declared against the Archbishop, had maintained their adherence to the Catholic religion by right of the statutes of the country, and had

[1] 'Schriften und Handlungen,' fol. 53, 150–154.

recommended the archbishopric to the protection of the Assistant Bishop. It would, therefore, have a very strange effect if an attempt were made to force the evangelical religion on them contrary to their inclination, and to start a war for this reason. Moreover the evangelical Estates were prohibited by the pacification of Augsburg from anything in the shape of active aggression; the terms of this treaty laid down clearly and distinctly in what manner an ecclesiastical prince should behave in case of changing his religion. To support Gebhard would be to bring on oneself the reproach of wishing to aid and abet him in violation of the Religious Peace, which, on his accession, he had sworn to respect, together with the Ecclesiastical Reservation included in it; besides which there existed in the archbishopric of Cologne sundry treaties and provincial statutes made on behalf of the Catholic religion, to which Gebhard had also pledged himself by oath. After the conclusion of the pacification of Augsburg the Estates had referred the vexed question of the Ecclesiastical Reservation to King Ferdinand for decision; and, far from his Majesty's verdict having been called in question on the reading and publication of the Recess, the Protestants had tendered him even warmer thanks for his paternal exertions than had the Catholics; they had signed the Recess and promised to conform to it entirely. Furthermore, at all subsequent imperial Diets, capitulation and electoral Diets, this same Recess had been confirmed anew without any single stipulation, and the Imperial Chamber had invariably been charged to frame its decisions in accordance with it. It was utterly impossible, therefore, after all these years, to fight the Ecclesiastical Reservation

on the grounds of the treatment it had received during the transactions concerning the Religious Peace. He, for his part, heartily wished that this clause had never been inserted in the Religious Peace, or that it could be interpreted in some other sense than that attached to it by the Catholic party; but anyone who looked at the matter dispassionately was forced to allow that the explanation given by the Catholics accorded with the text of the treaty. Gebhard's enterprise, Augustus went on, was all the more opposed and combated by the Catholic Estates on account of his having prematurely married. The evangelical Estates must also remember what a bad spirit of mutual distrust existed in their own ranks, and how easily, amid their many and diverse aims and endeavours, they might fall out among themselves. No one of their party would consent to be second to another, none would suffer himself to be instructed, and so, as experience had shown, one disaster must continually follow another. For all these reasons it was most essential not to let things ripen into war, but to try to effect a friendly accommodation, and the Emperor had already offered his help in this direction. He recommended that efforts should be made to induce Gebhard to renounce the electorate of his own accord in consideration of an indemnity which the Emperor was willing to grant him, and that the Protestants should be allowed freedom of religious worship by their future Catholic lord.[1] For the stirring up of sedition and demoralising bloodshed Augustus reiterated in a later letter to the Elector of the Palatinate that 'he would not lend a hand.'[2]

With the Electors of Mayence and Treves also the

[1] Buder, *Sammlung*. pp. 93–116.

[2] Ennen, v. 116.

Elector Louis 'had already in March been carrying on a serious correspondence and interchange of deputations,' and he had admonished their graces 'to frustrate the wiles and intrigues of the Pope, and, for the glory of God and for the common weal of the beloved German Fatherland, whose degradation the Pope and his un-German followers were plainly bent on compassing, to oppose manly resistance.' He had pointed out threateningly to the Archbishops 'what awaited them if, as he hoped might not be the case, they associated themselves with the Elector Gebhard's party in transactions which were opposed to the general welfare of the Holy Empire,' for, he added, as was well known to them, 'it was an easy matter to kindle among the common people vehement hatred of the higher clergy, and conspiracies were to be apprehended among the many impoverished and ruined counts and the inferior nobility of the Empire.'[1] The two archbishops had addressed themselves to Louis, begging him to point out ways and means by which to rid the Empire of the Spanish and French troops (who were devastating the land with fire and rapine), and to put a stop to the Cologne dispute. At the same time the Emperor had required the Elector to charge his brother John Casimir to desist from his preparations for war. 'From all this' they thought themselves warranted at Heidelberg in concluding that 'the priests and their party must be quaking in their shoes.' 'Consequently,' we read in a letter from this town to the Council at Spires, 'if they tackle the business in good earnest things may take a favourable turn, and they may be able to lay solid foun-

[1] In a Mayence *Konvolut*: 'Korrespondenzen und Schickungen in Reichsachen, 1582-1583,' fol. 17-20.

dations both for the propagation of the holy evangel and for the maintenance of freedom.'[1] As for the Emperor's 'kindly intervention' in this affair of Gebhard's, the Counts Palatine John Casimir and Johann warned the town council of Frankfort on May 3 to have nothing to do with it; 'it was pure deception,' and had no other object than 'to hoodwink those Estates who were favourable to the Archbishop until such time as the opposition party had accomplished its intention.' Frankfort was not only to contribute the *Circle* money which it had promised, but a special aid also, after the example of Strasburg, and to canvas other towns for similar help.[2]

At the same time Count John of Nassau applied for help to the Prince of Orange and to the States-General. There was much, indeed, he made known to his brother, that was not in Gebhard's favour. He was not yet sufficiently acquainted with the true doctrine, he had but few genuine teachers among his clergy, and he was still somewhat timid in religious work from fear of the Lutheran electors and princes; he had also quite unnecessarily 'laid himself under too much obligation to the Confession of Augsburg.' He had not gone through any proper preparation for his enterprise; he did not understand the art of government; he did not understand the art of warfare; he had no experienced officers, no military engineers, only seditious, mutinous soldiers. He had placed too much reliance on the great lords, and from the outset 'he had based his policy too much on war and rigour.' On the other hand it was in his favour that he recognised the abominableness of the papacy, and had spoken out openly against it, that he had the whole of Westphalia in his power, and that he

[1] 'Schriften und Handlungen,' fol. 121, 123–125. [2] *Ibid.* fol. 86.

also possessed strong places on the Rhine and an abundant store of artillery at Bonn. Furthermore, some five hundred French soldiers were marching up to his support, Count John Casimir was on the point of espousing his cause openly and taking the field, and the Protestant Electors and princes, both verbally and in writing, and through delegates to the Emperor and cathedral chapter, had expressed themselves to the effect that 'they could not well draw back without loss of honour.' Further points to his advantage were that the cathedral chapter had robbed him with violence, and had introduced Spanish troops into the land, and finally that the Pope had excommunicated him, 'and had thus assumed to himself the right to depose Electors and Estates at his own pleasure.' It was before all things essential for Gebhard, John of Nassau urged, that he should obtain the support of the Netherlands. From the very first he had set all his hopes on John Casimir and on the Prince of Orange, and he would 'gladly see the affairs of the Netherlands and the Cologne affair merged into one common cause.' Count John therefore begged the Prince to inform Gebhard 'as to what help and support he might expect from himself and from the Netherlands, either in money, troops, ships, munitions, or anything else. In conclusion Orange was further asked 'if something could not be done in the bishopric of Liege for better security in keeping the enemy out of Cologne and Westphalia.' [1]

'The strongest advocate' for Gebhard's 'pure and holy cause' was the Calvinist King Henry of Navarre. In order to bring about a general league of all the

[1] 'Die Schriftstücke vom Mai–Juni, 1583,' in Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 191–214.

Protestant Powers against the Austrian Imperial House and the King of Spain, and if possible to procure for himself the German crown, Henry, in July 1583, sent the president of his Privy Council, Jacques de Ségur-Pardeillan, and the jurist Sofroi de Calignon round to these different potentates. The ambassadors went first to the court of Queen Elizabeth of England, where, according to Henry's instructions, they represented that 'whereas the Protestant princes of Germany had agreed together to prevent, if possible, the choice of a King of the Romans from the House of Austria, Gebhard's change of religion had happened most opportunely, for by it the majority of votes in the Electoral College had fallen to the Protestants. Henry of Navarre begged the Queen to deposit 200,000 thalers in Germany for the support of these princes; he himself was sending to the Empire for the same object a good round sum of money and many costly jewels; a league of the Protestant Powers would be stronger than a league of the Catholics. In order, however, to be able to confront the House of Austria and the Pope, 'the Roman Antichrist,' 'the Beast,' with united forces, and to lead 'the orthodox Church' to victory, Henry considered it of primary importance to effect an alliance of the Lutheran and reformed Churches.

Elizabeth fell in with this opinion and gave the ambassadors letters to the German princes and the King of Denmark, in which she most urgently commended to them the alliance proposed by Henry, and made them princely promises in case of their agreeing with his idea.

The ambassadors then forthwith repaired to the Netherlands and presented themselves at the courts

of the different Lutheran princes, assuring the latter that not in Germany only, but also in France, Luther was considered the founder of the evangelical doctrine, and that the French Protestants also regarded him as the worthiest successor of the Apostles. This being so, they said, the name of Lutherans belonged to them as much as to their German brothers, whereas the appellations of 'Calvinists, Zwinglians, Sacramentarians' were all the more objectionable as they only served to strengthen and confirm an unholy separation between the sons of one mother. Even if hitherto there had been no success in settling the contentions between the different Protestant Churches they must not despair of the possibility of doing so, and they hoped the German princes would consent to all the evangelical Churches being summoned as soon as possible to a General Synod, at which religious unity should be re-established. But if this could not be managed, they begged that the Lutheran Estates would at any rate no longer continue to oppose a political alliance with the reformed sects. They should, before all things, seriously consider the immense significance of present events in the archbishopric of Cologne for Protestantism in general and for their own individual welfare in particular. As King Philip of Spain had only one very sickly son left, the union of his kingdom with the German branch of the Habsburgs was greatly to be feared; there was not a shadow of doubt that Philip's eldest daughter would be married either to the Emperor or to one of his brothers. And what the union of Spain with the Empire meant for the evangelical Estates and for German liberty they had fully experienced under Charles V. If, however, these

Estates persisted in their discord and their separation from their foreign co-religionists they would be able to oppose still less resistance than formerly to the might of both the Habsburg lines united in one. If, on the contrary, they agreed to the proposals of Henry of Navarre, viz. to support Gebhard and to insure him victory over Ernest of Bavaria and the Catholic Estates, Protestantism would be everywhere triumphant. With a majority in the College of Electors they would be able not only to prevent any union of the Empire with the Spanish monarchy by the prompt election of a King of the Romans from another House, but also, for all futurity, to secure the imperial throne to a candidate approved by the Protestants.[1]

Such were the reasons for which the King declared Gebhard's affair to be 'a pure and holy one,' 'more important than any that had stirred Christendom for centuries;' 'no case,' he wrote to John Casimir, 'was of greater significance with regard to the ruin of the papacy.'[2]

While Gebhard with his fierce military hordes was actively engaged in Westphalia in the propagation of

[1] Duplessis-Mornay, ii. 272–284, 289. Henry's despatches of July 1583 to the King of Sweden, the King of Denmark, &c., in Berger de Xivrey, i. 531, 535, 540, 557. See, on the other hand, pp. 562–564, what he wrote on July 31 to the Emperor, to whom he wished to show 'omni genere officiorum atque obsequiorum,' how much he was attached to him. Ségur was above all to depict to the Emperor the abominations of the Popes. See Henry's instructions of July 15, 1583, in the *Incendium Calvinisticum*, pp. 178–189. Sugenheim, *Frankreichs Einfluss*, i. 385 ff. Cf. v. Bezold, *Rudolf II. und die heilige Liga*, pp. 353, 365 ff. Concerning the pamphlet *Incendium Calv.* see Lossen in the *Sitzungsberichte der Münch. Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1891, Heft i. p. 140 ff., where an attempt is made to fasten the authorship on the Bavarian councillor Erasmus Fend.

[2] Despatch of July 18, 1583, and of March 12, 1584, in Berger de Xivrey, i. 541, 648.

the holy evangel, John Casimir had hastily levied troops in order with 'a swift hand to help on the holy cause against the Roman Antichrist and his godless followers' on the Rhine. Again and again the Emperor had issued edicts against the Count Palatine. Contrary to all the statutes of the Empire and to the imperial command itself, so ran the charge, he had collected troops and had appointed a definite mustering place in the neighbourhood of Worms; he had presumed to obstruct the passes and the country roads by force, even to block up the Rhine and to intercept all commerce; and he had actually had the audacity to stop the further progress of the papal Legate, Cardinal Andreas of Austria, and to put some of his servants in gaol, although the Cardinal had applied to him and to the Palatine Elector for a safe-conduct. He must immediately set these prisoners free, he must desist from his military preparations and give no further cause for disturbances in the Empire and for the complaints of the peaceful neighbouring States, and he must abstain in future from daring to obstruct the public highways.

John Casimir, however, recognised no imperial commands. He was, he said, 'an instrument of God for the promotion of His honour and glory,' a 'Christian champion,' who 'was obliged to resort to war for the establishment of peace,' an out and out disinterested prince, whose misfortune it was 'to have had it charged against him by the vermin of the Roman Antichrist that in his enterprise for God and for the freedom of the German Fatherland he was seeking some private advantage.' [1]

[1] John Casimir's remarks to Peter Breuer, the councillor of the Elector

His disinterestedness showed itself in a secret treaty concluded with Gebhard on April 12, in which the latter mortgaged to him and to his successors the archbishopric of Cologne, with all the towns, hamlets, and castles appertaining thereto, together with all the tolls, rents, and taxes: John Casimir was to retain and enjoy all these, and govern and dispose of them according to his pleasure, until such time as he had been fully compensated for his expenditure in Gebhard's service. On April 15 Gebhard had nominated the Count Palatine his administrator plenipotentiary and had conferred on him the right to receive all the contributions granted by the Protestant Estates and to raise on his (Gebhard's) security any money that might be needed.[1]

'After making all his preparations with so much foresight, and when the aggrandisement of the Palatine House by means of large possessions and true religion, and the suppression of all antagonists, seemed beyond possibility of doubt,'[2] John Casimir began his march at the head of 7,000 mercenaries. Duke William of Bavaria was informed that Doctor Beuterich, the most influential councillor of the Count Palatine, had said to a very intimate friend in strictest secrecy that his lord's war and the whole business had no other object than to get rid of both the newly chosen Elector and the former one, and to establish Casimir as Elector.'[3]

of Mayence, according to his report of July 19, 1583, in the correspondence referred to above, p. 66, note.

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 94–95, No. 118.

[2] These were the Count Palatine's own words (so Peter Breuer reported in the letter quoted above, p. 66, note 1, 'at a great drinking bout' in Heidelberg.

[3] v. Bezold, ii. 148, No. 193. A *Memoriale D. Minutii quoad legationem in urbem* says, 'Casimiri pacta cum apostata ejusdemque jactantia in

He himself, indeed, had written in his note-book in October 1582, 'If the bishop at Cologne cannot keep possession of anything let him resign his bishopric to me; I shall see.' [1]

Before his incursion on the Rhine John Casimir published a manifesto similar to the one with which many years earlier the Margrave Albert of Brandenburg-Culmbach had inaugurated his 'evangelical war.' [2] It was not for his own interest and profit, the Count Palatine said, but solely for the furtherance of God's glory, for the maintenance of the Public Peace and the Religious Peace, and to protect the freedom of the German nation that he was entering the field, he who was known everywhere, at home and abroad, as a man of pacific temper. The tyranny and the bloodthirsty aggression of the Pope must be withstood. With a view to the suppression of the imperial majesty, of the true religion, and of all the rights and liberties of the Germans, the Pope, in violation of the Religious Peace, had excommunicated Gebhard and deprived him of all his dignities, and he was intending to deluge the land with blood. The Emperor, misled by the nuncios, was labouring under the erroneous impression that an ecclesiastical prince, on going over to the evangelical religion, was bound to resign his dignities and his emoluments; this was the explanation of Rudolf's behaviour towards Gebhard. No notice, however, must

fratris nuptiis, quod brevi futurus esset elector' (v. Bezold, ii. 149, note 2).

[1] v. Bezold, i. 557.

[2] See our remarks, vol. vi. p. 455 ff. The physician Helisäus Röslin had cast the nativity of the Count Palatine, and in this it was stated that 'as from his mother he derived half margravian blood,' so he had 'much margravian spirit.' Röslin also predicted an impending rising of Austria.

be taken of it. For the peace and freedom of the German nation it was imperatively necessary that the Ecclesiastical Reservation, which aimed at the destruction of the Augsburg Confession, should be abolished and that the long wished for freedom in religious matters should be introduced. The Catholic Estates, by fire and sword, by sentences of exile, by denial of justice, by outvoting at imperial and other Diets, by oppressive decrees forced on bishoprics and imperial cities, had gone on down to the present moment cruelly persecuting the Augsburg Confessionists. All their transactions and schemes had but one object, viz. to exhaust the strength of the Estates of the Augsburg Confession and then to exterminate them. In this endeavour the Pope was affording them every possible help by means of his peace-loathing nuncios and the treacherous rabble of Jesuits who were being smuggled in everywhere. The Pope was the Antichrist, and for centuries past, with his raging and storming and his godless so-called Councils, he had been the cause of all the evil that had tormented Christendom. It was the duty of the ecclesiastical Electors and princes to emancipate themselves from papal tyranny and servitude and, for the good of the Fatherland and on behalf of general liberty and tranquillity, to join with the other Estates in declaring that they would recognise but one supreme head—the Emperor. In consideration of the noble object of his war he was sure that everybody would exonerate him, the Count Palatine, for not having allowed himself to be deterred from his

Styria, and Carinthia, and ended with the exhortation, 'Open your eyes and close your fists; let who will take spear in hand' (v. Bezold, ii. 129–130).

intentions by the Emperor Rudolf's admonitions. For the protection of the Emperor, injured so grievously in his rights, he was now about to take up arms.[1]

Thus the war of religion was formerly proclaimed. The lawless, half savage mercenaries, led into the archbishopric by John Casimir towards the end of August, were to set the business going. 'Wake up,' was the cry of a writer in verse:

Awake, attend, my message hearken;
Woe, anguish, blood, thy future darken.
Awake, Lord of the Empire Roman,
Drive from thy father's land the foeman;
Awake! they're gambling for thy throne,
Thy crown, O Emperor, is at stake.
Bohemia, Austria, and Bourgogne
Will be hit hard. Awake! awake!
Electors, princes, all beware
Ye be not blinded by false glare.
Strike quickly, or 'twill be in vain;
And thus you'll save the reputation
Of the noble German nation.

John Casimir, said the Archduchess Maria of Austria, 'like the Devil's messenger, is sowing all manner of evil throughout Christendom; but he will certainly get his due reward.'[2]

The Count Palatine had miscalculated. The military forces of the Archbishop Ernest were superior to his own. Duke William of Bavaria had not only

[1] *Ausschreiben*, &c., 1583, full title in Häberlin, xiii. 358, note. This proclamation of the religious war throws light on the concluding words of Lossen, ii. 686, who is inclined to attribute 'the breaking out of the religious war and its consequences, the ruin of the material prosperity and the intellectual culture of the Rhenish-Westphalian people during more than half a century, to those who armed themselves to resist the overthrow of existing conditions.' Here the Old Catholic Lossen, whose exposition is otherwise not so objective as he would have us think, shows for once his true visage.

[2] Hurter, i. 225.

helped his brother with considerable sums of money but had also sent him 1,000 cavalry and 4,000 infantry. 'I hope,' he wrote, 'you will find them all efficient men and not a mere scratch lot, like the Casimir people.'[1] The country suffered 'terribly from the ravages of the war, for on both sides there was no mercy, but in fire and plunder the troops of Casimir were first and foremost.' Independent of any plan of warfare the Count Palatine marched hither and thither in the land, pillaging and laying waste; churches and convents especially were the objects of his plunder and incendiarism; he ransacked and burnt them down ruthlessly; 'the poor people in the villages were cruelly maltreated, as if by wild beasts, and driven out naked, not to mention the inhuman, unnatural outrages which were the order of the day.' At Lülsdorf Gebhard found his way into the camp of John Casimir, and he boasted in a public despatch of his 'Christian, godly work' against 'the priestly rabble and the Pope, who was not God's but the Devil's lieutenant, the tyrant of consciences, the murderer of souls.' It was only because 'he would not serve the Pope, but God,' he said in his patent of September 17, that he had thus been deprived of his dignities in opposition to God, honour, and justice. 'Because in the Cologne diocese error was more loved than God's Word, God had punished this archbishopric with the plague of Jesuits, who would restore again all the most abominable idolatries of the Pope's invention.'[2] Gebhard's activity consisted entirely in writing des-

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 266, 271, note 19.

[2] Ennen, v. 128 ff. 1. As recently as 1578 Gebhard had taken the Jesuits under his protection against the slanders of the Calvinists (Bianco. i. 923).

patches of this sort and in profligate banquets and drinking bouts. 'Seldom was he seen sober; he drank from morning to night.'[1] John Casimir himself allowed that Gebhard 'was more addicted to luxury and other such things than to indulging in lofty thoughts.'[2]

John Casimir's own thoughts 'had been very lofty' at the beginning of the war, but 'they were burnt to ashes, like the many farms, villages, and castles that he himself set on fire.' He had thought easily to put an end to the Cologne affair, and then after concluding a treaty with the States-General he had intended to lead his army into the Netherlands, to join together in united action the Protestant forces of Germany, France, and England, and everywhere to root out the Catholic religion. 'A godly wishe,' wrote an English ambassador from Bonn to Queen Elizabeth, 'but an impossible acte, to my capacity; all which in my opinion will resolve into smoke.'[3]

'Our progress grows more and more similar to the crab's walk,' says a despatch of September 21, 1583, from the Count Palatine's camp, near Mülheim; 'Truchsess is with us, but he does not concern himself about anything; he generally fills himself with drink at the midday meal, and when he has had an hour's sleep he begins to meddle with and upset everybody, and never even offers to help Casimir; owing to his negligence it is now impossible to get the artillery into the field. Casimir is terribly down in the dumps

[1] 'Quamdiu in hac arce Lulsdorfensi morabatur, raro sobrius visus est. Consurgebat mane ad sectandum ebrietatem, potandumque usque ad vesperas' (Ab Isselt. p. 341).

[2] Ennen, v. 30. See the four rhymed satires on Gebhard and Agnes in the *Zeitschrift des bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, xii. 77-86.

[3] Wright, *Queen Elizabeth*, ii. 24. Cf. Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 274.

because nothing can be set going. The Jülich peasants are beginning to band themselves together; whenever they get hold of any of our men they strike them dead like dogs, and in this way we have already lost many of our soldiers. I cannot blame the peasants for this, for they are being treated more cruelly than anything I have ever seen before when we have been in the enemy's land.' Between John Casimir's German and French troops suspicion and distrust were creeping in. 'Last night again, and this morning, a considerable number of both nationalities have been stabbed.' 'The French soldiers,' says another despatch, 'are half full of devils, and discontented in the extreme.' [1] Casimir's military expedition,' a councillor of the Landgrave William of Hesse reported to Cassel on September 25, 'is such an absurdity that nearly everybody makes game of it.' [2]

In expectation of great results from his brother's campaign the Elector Louis of the Palatinate, on August 21, had invited the Protestant Electors, princes, and Estates to a general convention at Mühlhausen, in Thuringia.

'In the full splendour of the Gospel light now shining,' Louis said in his despatch, 'the Pope had dared to depose and excommunicate the Archbishop of Cologne, and from the disgraceful manner in which he depreciated and humiliated the evangelical religion and its professors, as well as from the action of his artful, mischievous nuncios, who were now scarcely recognised in the Empire,' it seemed as if the Council of Trent was going to take effect in Germany also, and the Religious Peace be annulled. The Pope was endeavouring

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 164–166. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 166.

unintermittently, and not fruitlessly, to incense the Emperor and the Catholic Estates against the Evangelicals. In Cologne he had been instrumental in causing the legitimate Archbishop to be made war upon by his disobedient canons, contrary to the terms of the civil and religious peace, and without the co-operation of foreign troops, as if he had, thanks to the Ecclesiastical Reservation, excluded himself from the archbishopric by his change of religion and marriage. Now the Estates of the Augsburg Confession had from the very first protested against the Ecclesiastical Reservation, and had never paid any attention to it. In proof of this he could cite many instances of distinguished archbishops and bishops who had adopted the Augsburg Confession and had married, and nevertheless had retained their benefices. From all this it was plain to see that the Pope and his followers had only been waiting for the right opportunity 'to vent their bloodthirsty feelings' on those who had turned from popish, misleading, idolatrous teaching to the true, infallible Word of God, and to do away with the freedom of the ecclesiastical Electors and princes: the Pope intended to bring us all under his yoke again. The grievances of the Augsburg Confessionists were indeed multiplied daily; the Christian religion was incessantly persecuted, and the total ruin of the German nation would speedily come about if serious measures of resistance were not carried into effect. For this purpose all the Estates of the Augsburg Confession must meet together, in order to consider how to withstand the intrigues of the Pope, how to help the Elector of Cologne, and how the Ecclesiastical Reservation was to be abolished. Also the oppressive oaths by which

the spiritual Electors and princes were bound to the Pope must be abolished, or at least modified, in order that they might persevere in the holy Evangel, and that the said Evangel 'might be propagated according to Christian obligation.' Furthermore, they must aim at rendering it impossible for citizens, landed proprietors, and subjects under the dominion of popish princes to be afflicted with judicial sentences and writs of outlawry, and compelled to migrate from their country; it must also be insisted that the imperial cities be granted permission to establish the Augsburg Confession, and that all subjects of the Empire be allowed freedom to adopt this creed. Due provision must also be made for the long needed reform of the Imperial Chamber. On the occasion of the Diet at Mühlhausen, which he (the Palatine Elector Louis) was summoning with the consent of the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, the political councillors of the Estates were first of all to meet on October 28, in order to consult together over all these matters, and to pass the resolution that all pernicious divisions among the professors of the Christian religion were to be avoided, and that they must all stand firmly together against the common enemy, the Pope.[1]

But whether all this would really be effected at the Mühlhausen Diet appeared to several of the Protestant Estates very doubtful. 'From quarters by no means insignificant,' wrote the town council of Worms on October 2, 'private intelligence had reached them that the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg had no intention, at the coming Diet, of associating themselves

[1] Lehmann, pp. 349–352. The despatch for Frankfort in the *Schriften und Handlungen*, fol. 233–244.

with a general coalition, union, and combination with other religious demonstrations against the papists.' These Electors were of opinion that the Estates of the Augsburg Confession were not 'warranted in their design, and that it was contrary to the literal contents of the Religious Peace; the Pope of Rome had long had recognised authority—and still retained it—to appoint and depose high ecclesiastical beneficiaries in Germany.' [1]

The Mühlhausen Diet fell through, owing to the death, on October 12, of the Elector Louis, who 'had been the organiser of the whole business.' [2]

Through this death also the Cologne war experienced a turn of fortune decidedly unfavourable for Gebhard. John Casimir with his army left the scene of action to take possession of the Palatine Electorate. Thenceforward Gebhard's position became every day more hopeless. 'Blindness, greed, ambition, mistrust, and despondency,' wrote Count John of Nassau to the Prince of Orange towards the end of November 1583, 'grow worse and worse; honour, manliness, and valour are so scarce that the end of the world may be looked for.' John Casimir had gone off unexpectedly, and it was now found out that, despite all warnings, 'cooks had been employed to cook the broth who had never cooked well nor done much good anywhere else;' everything had gone on in such a way that the enemies themselves could not wish for anything better. In Westphalia only had Gebhard maintained a respectable army, but though he had now 'introduced the true religion'

[1] Worms to Strasburg, October 2, 1583, in *Schriften und Handlungen*, fol. 260–262.

[2] Frankfort to Worms, October 15, 1583, in *Schriften und Handlungen*, fol. 266.

everywhere in that land, there was nevertheless 'a great dearth of pure, sound church and school officials;' and it would be better in all directions when Gebhard had filled the pulpits and public offices of the country in a more satisfactory manner, and 'established a little order in his government and in the management of his court.' [1]

Before the departure of John Casimir the ambassadors of Mayence, Treves, Saxony, and Brandenburg had proposed at a congress at Frankfort-on-the-Main that Gebhard should be requested to lay down his arms and to renounce the archbishopric of Cologne, and that a pension should be assigned him out of the taxes and revenues of the diocese. Gebhard, then still in possession of a considerable region of territory, had rejected this proposal defiantly, because 'he dared not act in opposition to the honour and glory of God, and he was bound to weaken the power of the Pope.' [2] On this failure of an attempt by gentle measures, Duke William of Bavaria urged on the Emperor that he ought now at last to pronounce the sentence of the ban on this fomenter of sedition, and insist on the execution of the order. At the imperial court, however, promises had already been made to the Protestant Electors of fresh attempts at reconciliation which were to be considered at a Diet at Rothenburg on the Tauber, and to which Mayence, Treves, Saxony, and Brandenburg, the Archduke Ferdinand, and Duke Louis of Würtemberg had been invited, but not the Count Palatine of Bavaria.

He had vainly striven, the Emperor informed the assembly at Rothenburg in April 1584, to persuade the Archbishop Gebhard quietly to resign and to accept

[1] Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 275–283. [2] Ennen, v. 116, 141–142.

an indemnity, and afterwards he had as vainly sought to hinder the outbreak of the war; the negotiations of the Elector had been equally fruitless; the parties concerned had recommenced levying troops, and all sorts of other dangerous intrigues were being plotted in the Empire. If the Estates, instead of supporting him in the administration of the laws of the realm, continued defiantly to help and favour any and every one who assumed the right of violating these laws and of defying the authorities, the result could only be destruction of all order and legislation, the formation of more and more leagues and conspiracies, the increase of sedition and apostasy, and finally the ruin of the Empire. What had once been settled and assented to must be honourably fulfilled; the honour, renown, and dignity of the Empire must be maintained, and Germany must not be allowed to become a prey to foreign nations bent on fostering discord in the land, and a laughing-stock to the whole world. He begged, therefore, that the representatives of the Estates would confer with the imperial commissioners as to means whereby, above all things, the military proceedings against Cologne might be stopped, and the archbishopric of Cologne, together with the neighbouring States, be saved from any further oppression on their account. Further, he wished them to consider what steps could be taken to insure the uninterrupted enforcement of the imperial statutes with regard to the Religious Peace and the Public Peace, and the business of war, and to make it possible for the Estates of both religions to live peaceably side by side. But the representatives of the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg and of the Duke of Würtemberg would not enter into negotiations of this sort, because they

had only received instructions and authority to go on with the Frankfort transactions. The proposal of the delegates of Mayence and Treves, and of the Archduke Ferdinand, that the Emperor should endeavour to persuade Truchsess, the author of all the disturbance, to lay down his arms, and to restore, under pain of the law, all that he had taken possession of to the newly elected Archbishop, they declared to be dangerous. It would be far better once more 'to try goodness, the honourable substitute for the sword, and to renew the proposal of resignation to the Truchsess.'[1] The delegate of the Elector of Saxony, Eric Volkmar von Berlepsch, told the Chancellor of the Elector of Treves, Doctor Wimpheling, that he thought the best expedient would be to summon the two Electors, the newly elected one and the deposed one, both to Rothenburg, in order to give them a hearing and arrange an accommodation between them. 'What's the good?' answered the Chancellor. 'Do we want any further inquiry? Everything is so plain and palpable that it is impossible to doubt the facts. Have not both parties already been tried at Frankfort? Did not Gebhard Truchsess himself confess to everything and actually boast of his doings? The same power which appointed and confirmed him has legitimate authority, after due inquiry, to depose him from his dignity. The authority and jurisdiction of the Pope over the Catholic clergy has by no means been curtailed or abolished by the Religious Peace; on the contrary it has been strengthened and confirmed, for the text of this treaty expressly says that the right of elections, confirmations, and so forth, remains in the hands of those who had

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 203-204.

held it up till then. We Catholics are not going to be frightened now, any more than formerly at Frankfort, into deserting our legitimate head or into giving away the papal rights in this respect. The only way to settle the business in a plain, straightforward, German manner is for the Protestants to leave the Catholics free and unmolested, just as they themselves wish to be left.' [1]

'All manner of dangerous intrigues,' as the imperial commissioners had said, were indeed to be feared in the Empire, although, when the assembly at Rothenburg broke up without having accomplished anything, 'Gebhard's undertaking might be considered as good as frustrated.' On August 15, 1583, the Emperor had admonished the town council of Frankfort to be on their guard against attacks which would be made on some of the towns, possibly also on Frankfort, in order to get possession of the money deposited by the Circles for aid against the Turks.[2] Shortly before the assembly took place at Rothenburg the council had spoken similar warnings to a delegate of the Elector of Mayence

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 275–276. On May 6, 1584, the Chancellor of the Elector of Treves wrote as follows to the papal nuncio concerning the claims of the Protestants at Rothenburg: 'Truchsessii flagitia nobiscum sese execrari simulant et eum auctoritate Cæsaris et Ordinum omnino repellendum promittere videbantur, si Summi Pontificis auctoritate abrogata, huiusmodi in futurum episcopatuum causæ Cæsari et Ordinibus Imperii decidendæ concederentur.' This, however, had been most emphatically repudiated on the part of the Catholics (Theiner, iii. 494). The imperial commissioners made it plain at Rothenburg that the Pope's jurisdiction, 'especially in Catholic places,' had not been suspended or curtailed by the Religious Peace; 'otherwise the Religious Peace would not be *pax concordiæ*, but *magis dissolutio, immo ipsa discordia pacis*' (v. Bezold, ii. 203, note 1, at the end). Concerning the Rothenburg conclave see Hirn, ii. 190 ff.: see also *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 688; Lossen, ii. 510 ff.

[2] 'Kaiserschreiben,' 15, fol. 115, in the Frankfort archives.

with regard to some threats uttered by the Count Palatine John Casimir that he would come at the right moment and make his reckoning with the merchants. His lord, the Elector, so the delegate reported, had been warned that there was a plot 'for setting fire to his parsons' den by a secret train of gunpowder, and if great damage was done to the town it would all be the fault of the priests who opposed the Evangel;' and in truth 'gunpowder had been discovered in great quantities and several people had been convicted of planning incendiarism.' It was believed that the Count Palatine George Hans of Veldenz, 'the terror alike of friends and foes—for he was a thoroughly good-for-nothing prince'—had had a hand in the game, and was using the championship of the Gospel as a cloak for robbing and pillaging.[1] In 1583 and 1584 George Hans had repeatedly threatened his relations, with whom he was on quarrelsome terms, that he would devastate the Palatinate and 'plunge the whole Rhine district into such a bath of blood as had never been seen before;' he would intrigue with the French and the Spaniards in the Empire, and in case of dire necessity he would actually coalesce with the papists and use their help to revenge himself; if he had nothing, the other Palatine Counts should have nothing also and should be brought to ruin.[2] As formerly he had aimed at getting the bishopric of Spires or the archbishopric of Treves into the hands of his son George Gustavus,[3] so now he hoped to raise the latter to the position of Gebhard's coadjutor. The Bohemian Wenzel Zuleger, a zealous Calvinist, who under Frederic III. had been the chief fomenter of the

[1] *Kurmainzischer Bericht*, March 23, 1584.
[2] v. Bezold, ii. 176–178, 234–235.
[3] See above, p. 3–5.

military policy of the Palatine Electorate, had advised Gebhard in November 1583 to procure the help of Georg Hans, who 'would get his son into some post.' He indicated the men by means of whom the Count Palatine and Truchsess might organise alliances with King Henry of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, the French Churches and those of the Netherlands.[1] On December 5 Gebhard addressed an urgent appeal to the French Calvinists for the largest possible amount of pecuniary help, saying that if he could only succeed in maintaining his ground 'the Antichrist would sink down dead to the bottom.'[2]

Nevertheless 'it was now too late for everything.' At the end of January 1584 his chief stronghold, Bonn, fell into the hands of the Elector Ernest; at the end of March the rest of his forces were utterly defeated at Terburg on the Alten Yssel, and soon after the duchy of Westphalia was swept clean of his troops. He betook himself to the Netherlands, under the protection of William of Orange, but the latter also, even had he willed it, was not in a position to afford him military succour. After all possible means had been attempted for nearly twenty years to turn the people of the Netherlands away from the Catholic faith, and to make them take up arms against their hereditary ruler, Orange was forced to confess, in a confidential letter to his brother John, that the immense majority of the people were loyal to their hereditary king and to the Catholic faith.[3]

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 199-200. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 181.

[3] 'La puissance du Roy d'Espaigne est telle en ce païs, que sans y faire passer ny Espaignol, ny Italien, en moins d'un an, sans aucune armée, il peult exterminer la religion presque de tout le païs et, peu de

'Forsaken by all,' Gebhard turned for help to Queen Elizabeth of England. 'To save his own conscience and those of his people,' he said, 'he had abandoned the Roman worship of idols.' But the so-called maiden Queen, who saw that his enterprise had made utter shipwreck, returned this time the virtuous answer that 'his marriage had plainly shown that he was not so much impelled by the spirit of faith as by the carnal prickings of worldly lust; by the irregularity of his behaviour he had obliged all to turn their backs upon him.' She sent him, nevertheless, an 'English alms' of 2,000 thalers. The Countess Agnes, whom Gebhard sent to England in the hopes that she might mollify the Queen, had still less success. Agnes contracted suspicious connections with the Earl of Essex, Elizabeth's favourite, and was obliged to leave the country by the Queen's order.[1] In March 1585 King Henry of Navarre made another appeal to Queen Elizabeth's heart in favour of 'the godly cause of Gebhard, of such vital importance for all Christendom,'[2] but again without any success.

In the year 1584, or 1585, the Archbishop Ernest had been received into the College of Electors,[3] but he was by no means happy resting on his laurels in a

temps après, de tout le reste de nos voisins. *Le nombre du peuple qui le favorise et qui est de sa religion surpasse infiniment quasi partout*, qui fera tout ce que luy sera commandé par l'Espaignol, comme il se voit journellement; car si l'ennemi vient à gagner quelque ville ou part de païs sur nous, le peuble faict entièrement et servilement tout ce qu'il veult et aussitost' (Groen van Prinsterer, viii. 358).

[1] Barthold, *Gebhard Truchsess*, &c., pp. 70–72.

[2] Berger de Xivrey, ii. 18.

[3] Mayence and Treves confirmed his admission in the summer of 1584; but Saxony and Brandenburg did not follow suit till the beginning of February 1585; see Zöchbaur, i. 27.

completely ruined archbishopric, which still for years to come had to taste the terrors of war.[1]

[1] See Riezler, iv. 646. In the amelioration of ecclesiastical conditions the Cologne nuncio Bonomi developed untiring activity, and readers may now become acquainted with his labours through his reports, published by Ehses-Meister, in *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, 1585–1590, i. 1 (Paderborn, 1895). The tasks which he had to accomplish were the cleansing of the Cathedral and the collegiate chapters from heretical elements, the introduction of the *Professio fidei* and the Bull *In Cœna Domini*, the abolition of concubinage and simony among the clergy, and the culture of the clergy in educational and moral respects, the nurture of the lower and higher schools, especially of the theological colleges and seminaries, the introduction and promotion of religious associations, especially the Jesuits, and last, but not least, the securing of genuinely Catholic bishops to fill the different dioceses (p. xliii). That Bonomi was the right man for all this work is shown by the documents, 169 in number, collected together by Dr. Ehses in his Cologne *Nuntiaturbericht*. Bonomi began his labours—reform labours in the best sense of the word—in Treves, where he received the most zealous support from the distinguished Archbishop Johann VII. of Schönenberg. The papal nuncio next took in hand the districts of Cologne, Münster, and Liege, where he instituted, on similar lines, a wonderfully blessed work of reform. In the above mentioned places ecclesiastical life revealed grave abuses; in Cologne especially the immorality of the Elector Ernest (who had entered the Church more on compulsion than from free-will) gave cause for constant serious complaints. All that could be done for the removal of abuses and the improvement of Church conditions Bonomi accomplished. Whereas the holding of synods was not immediately possible either in Cologne, on account of the fall of Neuss, in Treves, on account of the outbreak of French military disturbances after the death of the Duke of Alençon, or in Mayence, owing to the lukewarmness of the Elector Wolfgang, Bonomi endeavoured at any rate to manage an assembly of the sort at Liege. No difficulties could daunt the spiritual zeal of the nuncio; partly by wise compromise, partly by unflinching firmness, he gained his end. The diocesan synod held at the beginning of October 1585 went off in the best possible manner, and by its means a solid foundation was laid for complete and lasting reform of the diocese of Liege. Bonomi himself then undertook the arduous task of finishing the work of the synod, of accustoming the clergy and the people to the new ecclesiastical life and establishing them in it; he himself travelled over nearly the whole of the collective dioceses, visited everywhere churches and convents, and instituted a number of most salutary reform measures. In the midst of his labours Bonomi, who never spared himself (although suffering severely from gout, and using the baths at Aix-la-Chapelle, he would insist upon administering the

'The vast undertaking of Truchsess and his adherents against Cologne, which, had it succeeded, would have

sacrament of confirmation to the Catholics of that town), was overtaken by death on February 25, 1587. On his work and his life Ehses passes the following admirable sentence: 'Filled entirely with the spirit of St. Charles Borromeo, an enthusiast for the reforms of the Council of Trent, — he inclined somewhat to sternness and austerity, and it lies in the nature of things that in those countries and provinces where Protestantism had gained a wide footing the Catholic portion of the population also was not amenable to the full severity of ecclesiastical law. But here too witness is borne to Bonomi's discretion and to the truly episcopal spirit in which he viewed his work, for he repeatedly forced himself into practising mildness and consideration, in order not to imperil his usefulness or alienate anyone without imperative cause. He was only fifty years old when he died, and the labours of this comparatively short life are divided between Italy and Switzerland, Germany from east to west, the Netherlands and northern France; everywhere and always his love for the Catholic Church, his solicitude for the Catholic people were the incentives to his self-sacrificing toil; everywhere he has earned for himself the lasting gratitude of the Catholic people, but most of all in Cologne and in the German Lower Rhine district, where his name is indissolubly connected with the triumphant repulse of the last dangerous attempt at Protestant coercion.' The profligate behaviour of Ernest caused the Cologne nuncio, Octavius Mirtus Frangipani, also many distressful hours. When the nuncio arrived in the Rhine district the Archbishop's guilty intercourse with Gertrude von Plettenberg and its consequences had just become publicly known. In November 1587 the nuncio remonstrated with him severely. Frangipani, in his account of this first conversation, evinces a certain amount of satisfaction, for the interview dissipated, at any rate, as utterly groundless, the fear to which Ernest's conduct had given rise, that he too, like his predecessor, would apostatise from the Church (Ehses, *Nuntiaturberichte*, i. 2, xxiv, 13–14, 41–44). In Cologne Frangipani found many excellent results of the Catholic restoration work; he was much edified by the large number of good, devout Catholics; he is frequent in his praises of the excellence and the zeal of the missionary clergy, who worked admirably in connection with the Jesuits; the learning and culture which prevailed both among the clergy and the laity filled him with astonishment. But Frangipani also found much that was not matter of rejoicing: ignorance and licentiousness among the clergy, especially in Westphalia, where Gebhard's apostacy had produced its after effects; the Rhine district also was not exempt from serious evils (Ehses, *loco citato*). The worst impediment here was the Archbishop himself, whose scandalous living was public history. Aware himself of his own unfitness, Ernest gave the nuncio unlimited authority for his Church

meant nothing less than the overthrow of the constitutions and statutes of the Holy Empire and of the Religious Peace, and would have been followed by the complete suppression and extirpation of the Catholic religion in all the bishoprics,' had 'happily been defeated, in spite of all home and foreign recruiting, intrigues, and military preparations.' But 'to all discerning people' it was 'clear to see that the Catholics had only gained a respite, and that for the Lutherans likewise, who were strangers to the plots and conspiracies with foreigners, there was as much to be feared from the Calvinists as from the Catholics.' 'The sedition-mongers in the Empire,' said a councillor of the Elector of Mayence, indulging in reflections in the late autumn of 1584, 'remain busy at work under the guise of religion, whereby they blind the poor German people and mislead them into fresh aggression and conspiracy, making it impossible for the Holy Empire ever again to recover peace and tranquillity. Imperial power is almost a nonentity; princes and people are impoverished, the Estates rent asunder, full of distrust and ill-feeling one against the other: intrigue has free play in the land. God have pity on us. What the Lutherans will have to undergo if the Calvinists get the upper hand is pretty well exemplified, methinks, at the present moment by the Count Palatine at Heidelberg.' [1]

labours in the archbishopric, whereupon Frangipani at once began to make arrangements for a diocesan visitation on an extensive scale. In this undertaking the nuncio experienced great difficulties, but they did not daunt him. Every opportunity that presented itself for furthering the interests of the Church was utilised by the Pope's representative, as is shown by his reports, so admirably edited by Ehses.

[1] From the draft of an instruction for a Mayence ambassador to the Elector of Brandenburg, November 27, 1584.

CHAPTER IV

ABOLITION OF LUTHERANISM AND REINTRODUCTION OF CALVINISM IN THE PALATINE ELECTORATE AFTER 1583

THE Elector Louis of the Palatinate had named in his will three Lutheran princes—Duke Louis of Würtemberg, the Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt, and the Margrave George Frederic of Brandenburg-Ansbach—as co-guardians with his Calvinistic brother John Casimir of his son Frederic; and he had done this 'chiefly with a view to preserving the true religion in the Electorate' and insuring that his children should be brought up in it.[1] But John Casimir set these wishes at defiance. His councillor La Huguerye reports that the Count Palatine, who had been informed of the contents of this will in the year 1582, had it in mind while making his preparations for the Cologne enterprise, and that he looked forward, on the death of his brother (who was ill at the time and not likely to live much longer), to having the necessary troops for taking forcible possession of the Palatinate, regardless of the claims of the other guardians.[2] This purpose of his he attained. Nobody after the death of Louis dared oppose resistance to the armed Count Palatine.[3] 'The rights of the

[1] Häusser, *Gesch. der rheinischen Pfalz*, ii. 142.

[2] La Huguerye, ii. 184–185.

[3] La Huguerye relates as follows: After the death of Louis, John Casimir, in his camp on the Rhine, was 'plus joyeux que l'estat de son

other guardians were annulled, which was tantamount to doing away with the whole will. John Casimir caused his jurist, Justus Reuber, to steal the will, which, according to John's injunction, was in the custody of the Heidelberg University, and he paid no attention to the orders of the Emperor and the Imperial Chamber demanding restitution of the document.[1] All protests and legal proceedings of the co-guardians were fruitless, for only 'he who had might had right.' Louis himself had set aside his father's will, which had provided for the maintenance of Calvinism, and now for John Casimir 'his brother's strict directions for the preservation of pure Lutheran doctrine and for the education of his ten-year-old successor in this same religion, which alone led to salvation, went together for nothing, so that Calvinism revived with great force.' The fears of the Lutherans were expressed by Conrad Geräus, superintendent of Oppenheim, in a funeral sermon on the defunct Elector on November 3. He compared Louis to Theodosius and Augustus: John Casimir, on the other hand, to Antonius, who 'as a warrior and a wicked man' had caused much disturbance and disaster; he showed also how in Greece 'the firebrand Alcibiades, in contradistinction to Solon, had kindled strife, war, misery, and bloodshed,' and now a like fate would befall

armée ne méritoit. Et me repondit en riant qu'il y pourvoiroit et changeroit de cartier, regardant Beutterich. Lequel me deist en oreille: Ouy, vous dictes vray; il fault changer de cartier et nous en aller loger à Heydelberg. L'Electeur est mort; il fault que mon maistre aille en diligence à Heydelberg, licencie et ramène son armée vers Francford; et vous et moy irons avec mon régiment et le promenerons par le Palatinat sur les terres ecclésiastiques, jusques à ce que mon maistre soit estably. Et voilà le but et la fin de nostre guerre . . . .' (La Huguerye, ii. 259. See pp. 262, 263, 267.)

[1] Häusser, ii. 142–143, 154 ff.

the Palatine Electorate.[1] The hatred of the Lutherans against the Calvinists was so deeply rooted that Louis's sister, the wife of the captive Duke John Frederic of Saxony, actually expressed her belief that the Elector had been poisoned. 'I believe,' she wrote on February 17, 1584, to her sister Susannah, Duchess of Saxe-Weimar, 'I believe he was bound to die, for the doctors and councillors were all Calvinists.'[2]

'With deep sorrow and intense anxiety.' Dorothea Susannah informed the Electress Anna of Saxony on May 12 that, by command of John Casimir, the ten-year-old Frederic, 'that tender, princely, and innocent Blood,' was to be 'forced into a misleading religion and compelled in his youth to imbibe the subtle poison of sacramentarian fanaticism.'[3] When Frederic's major-domo and preceptor refused to take him to hear Calvinistic sermons, and Frederic himself protested that it had been settled that he was to be left in his own religion, John Casimir, according to the account of the vicegerent and councillors of the Margrave George Frederic of Brandenburg-Ansbach, May 20, 1584, took him by the hand and dragged him by force into the church, notwithstanding that 'the young lord kicked and screamed and bellowed for help, and wept all through the service with his head hidden in his mantle.' 'It is undeniable,' wrote the Chancellor Einsiedel to

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 179, note 2. The bailiff and the keeper of the records at Oppenheim, who warned the superintendent and the other preachers against slandering from the pulpit, were answered angrily: they sang 'merrily the impious song of Nero: *hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*, and so forth. The officials themselves had lately, in Louis's lifetime, held secret meetings and sermons at Ingelheim, and had also administered so called sacraments, and had seduced some of the poor subjects into attending these services' (v. Bezold, ii. 184, note 1).

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 198, note 6.

[3] v. Weber, *Anna*, pp. 382–383.

the Elector Augustus of Saxony, who had sent him to Heidelberg, 'that Frederic is dragged with threats and violence to the Calvinistic services, and that he is not allowed to hear the sermons of your Electoral Grace's daughter's court preacher, nor even to visit her Princely Highness, however much she may entreat to see him.' John Casimir, however, declared that he was entirely in the right. If his deceased brother, 'under the influence of agitating, misguided priests,' had bequeathed instructions with regard to his son which would work injuriously for the heir, the country, and the people, he, Casimir, was not bound to carry out these instructions, seeing that he now stood in the place of father to the young lord.[1]

John Casimir was incited by the Landgrave William of Hesse to institute serious proceedings against the Lutheran clergy. The Landgrave, on hearing of a fruitless interview which the Count Palatine had had with the Heidelberg preachers, said in December 1583 that 'if he had been present he would have struck in with his stick and trodden the priests underfoot; he would have treated them as the Elector of Saxony treated his priests; they must not be allowed to escape, or they would denounce the Count Palatine all the world over.' He told John Casimir's ambassadors that what their lord should do was to put before both parties Bucer's 'Concord,' and send all those to prison who would not agree to it, and keep them there till they had come to a better mind. The Landgrave William even believed he had discovered that the Lutheran clergy 'had been ordered by the Pope to set the Electors and princes one against the other;' if

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 245–246.

John Casimir had 'at the very first caused their houses and libraries to be searched, he would certainly have found out something.' He ought to tell the priests that 'they had annoyed him quite enough during the lifetime of his brother, and they must now cease to vex him, or he would put them somewhere where neither the sun nor the moon would shine on them, and they would learn how ministers of the Church ought to behave to their rulers.' [1]

In April 1584 John Casimir organised at Heidelberg an eight-day disputation between Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians; at the head of the former stood John Marbach, at the head of the latter Jacob Grynäus. Things were carried on in the same way as in 1580, when Andreä was a disputant.[2] The students who attended proclaimed their sympathy with the Lutheran cause by actually stamping with their feet in the presence of the Count Palatine, and the Lutheran theologians cited this in their report as a proof of their victory, adding in further confirmation: 'When Grynäus came down from the chair and wanted to leave the auditorium to go home with Zanchius, Widebram, Tossanus, and others of his co-agitators, he was so tremendously hissed, hooted, and jeered at by the students that it was easy enough to see what the latter all thought of his disputation.' [3] The students

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 184, note 1. William, however, was by no means in sympathy with the Count Palatine's behaviour to his ward Frederic. An elector had quite as much right, he said, as Jews and Anabaptists to leave directions in his will for the religious education of his son (v. Bezold, ii. 216).

[2] See our remarks, vol. viii. pp. 431, 432.

[3] *Gründl. Bericht*, p. 305. See Struve, pp. 449–459.

also gave their verdict against Grynäus in writing.[1] 'Whosoever does not recognise,' said the Lutheran theologians, 'that the Calvinists are prompted and impelled by Satan, the father of lies, such a one must either be devoid of understanding, or else must have wilfully allowed himself to be blinded by Satan.'[2] The Calvinists, they declared, 'no longer look on us as human beings, as Christians, and as ministers of the divine Word, but as so many dogs;' they had incited John Casimir to bid for the heads of the Lutherans, and it was only the Elector's mercy that they had to thank for having merely been condemned to exile.[3] It was in vain that five hundred Lutheran burghers of Heidelberg addressed a petition to John Casimir begging him, in accordance with a former 'gracious assurance,' to leave their clergy in peace, for they were bound to God and to their consciences not to give up their own religion and 'they could not adopt another one.' Equally in vain did the Rector and professors of the University petition the Administrator not 'to tyrannise over their consciences and reduce them to despair by depriving them of the public exercise of their religion.'[4] The Lutheran clergy were turned out and went elsewhere in search of service and shelter.

The Rector and Syndicate of the University received instructions to admit the two reformed professors, Grynäus and Somnius, into the theological faculty in place of the deposed Lutherans, Marbach and Schopper. On the Rector's remonstrance that this would conflict

[1] '... Ioannem Iac. Grynaeum, non disputatoris, sed calumniatoris, non Theologi, sed Sophistae partes egregie sustinuisse ...' (*Gründl. Bericht*, pp. 310–311).

[2] *Gründl. Bericht*, 'Vorrede,' Bl. 3ᵃ. [3] *Gründl. Bericht*, pp. 361–383.

[4] *Gründl. Bericht*, pp. 344–349; Struve, pp. 480–482.

with the privileges of the college, and that he should bring the case before the academic senate, he was told that 'there was no need for a lot of palavering, there was no occasion for the University to pretend this, that, or the other, for this enactment had been decreed and settled by his Electoral Grace.'[1] The Calvinistic learned institutions, which Frederic III. had founded and endowed out of Catholic Church property, the Sapienz Kollegium and the Pädagogium at Heidelberg, and the schools at Neuhausen near Worms, and at Selz, had had to choose, under the Elector Louis, 'either between becoming Lutheran or being done away with;' all the Calvinists, teachers and students, had been removed from them.[2] Now 'the tables were turned and all the Lutherans were mercilessly evicted.' Out of a hundred 'Sapientists' only one declared himself willing to accept Calvinism.[3] The places of the orthodox stipendiaries, who had been natives of Germany, were now filled—so the Lutherans asserted—'by foreign Calvinists, ignorant men, young and ill-qualified for their work.'[4] The number of expelled Lutheran preachers amounted to several hundreds.[5]

When the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg remonstrated on the subject with the Administrator, John Casimir informed them, on February 24, 1585, that he had only 'given *congé* to a pack of disorderly rogues, ranters, and blasphemers, who, most of them, were not so exemplary, either in doctrine or in conduct, as to be of much service in the Church of God: puffed-

[1] *Gründl. Bericht*, pp. 336–337.

[2] See Hautz, *Gesch. des Pädagogiums zu Heidelberg*, p. 44 ff.; Häusser, ii. 91; Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, iii. 197.

[3] *Gründl. Bericht*, pp. 315–318. [4] *Gründl. Bericht*, iii.

[5] Wundt, iii. 194–197.

up, conceited fellows, covetous and ambitious, haughty, ill-behaved, and given to wine, men who had abolished the ancient Christian discipline that had prevailed up till then, and superseded it by gluttony, wine-bibbing, gambling, dancing, and extravagance in feasting and dress, and whose sermons consisted largely of calumny and abuse.'[1] They had attacked his and his father's honour so infamously, he said, that he had had good reasons for punishing them in person and life. Some of them had actually gone to such lengths in calumnious abuse as to declare that the Elector Frederic III. 'was not worthy to rest where other Christians lay; his remains ought to be disinterred and burnt.'[2] With regard to the Administrator's Lutheran wife, the ambassadors of Saxony and Brandenburg reported from Heidelberg on March 17, 1585:

'The people of the town and those of the court are no longer allowed to come to her services; the castle chapel is barricaded, and her ministers are obliged to preach to her and her ladies-in-waiting in the glass saloon.'[3]

Caspar Peucer had of old written to Crato concerning the Protestant theologians that 'they rage against each other in hatred, and by their sermons they pour the venom of their hatred into the minds and hearts of the ignorant masses.'[4] This statement was now receiving its accomplishment in 'ever more and more melancholy blindness of heart.' Year after year added violence and coarseness to the language of the controversial writings exchanged between the

[1] Kluckhohn, *Joh. Kasimirs Ehe*, pp. 147–148.
[2] v. Bezold, ii. 245, note 1.
[3] Kluckhohn, *Joh. Kasimirs Ehe*, p. 150. [4] Gillet, *Crato*, i. 305.

Lutherans and the Calvinists. When, in 1587, at John Casimir's behest, David Pareus published an edition of Luther's German Bible with a preface and summaries, the Lutherans demanded 'the execution of this vile rogue of a scholar who had been guilty of so many flagrant falsifications.' Jacob Andreä called the work 'a diabolical piece of arch-knavery, which deserved to be punished by Christian rulers with the gibbet.' [1] Righteous indignation was bestowed on one of the statutes of Frederic III.'s Church system, which the Administrator had revived and imposed on the whole country. It was the decree that 'children born out of wedlock were lost and damned, even though they should have been baptised.' [2]

Sebastian Franck had many years before complained as follows of Cæsar-papism: 'Everybody is obliged to worship the god of the land; if one prince dies and another of a different religion succeeds him, the Word of God is speedily changed, and the common people are thrown into a state of uncertainty.' [3] This complaint was now constantly reiterated. By princely command the inhabitants of the Palatinate had first been obliged to accept Lutheranism, then Calvinism, then again Lutheranism, and now once more 'all the people were expected to go back to Calvinism.'

[1] Struve, *Pfälz-Kirchenhistorie*, p. 488. Concerning Lucas Osiander's *Warnung an die christlichen Prediger und Zuhörer in der kurfürstlichen Pfalz, dass sie nicht stumme Hunde werden* (Tübingen, 1584), the Chancellor of Treves wrote to the Duke of Bavaria on May 26: 'This same little treatise is amusing to read, and it is astonishing that he, Osiander, uses just those arguments against the Calvinists which his (Osiander's) followers will not allow us to bring forward against themselves' (v. Bezold, ii. 206, note 1).

[2] *Von unchristlichen Calvinischen Lehrsätzen*, &c. (1589), D. 2.

[3] *Cosmograph*, p. 37.

When the Elector Louis had proceeded to his measures of violence for the reintroduction of the Lutheran faith, the Calvinistic theologians had complained that .' the changes in religion rob the people of all religion ;' [1] now the Lutheran theologians declared that, ' owing to the manifold and pernicious changes in religion, epicureanism and contempt of all religion whatsoever was being engendered in the hearts of many people.' [2]

' Actually under one and the same prince,' wrote Caspar Salm, a Palatiner, in 1589, intensifying Sebastian Franck's lament, ' the poor people are compelled to adopt different creeds ; this has happened several times in Saxony, and we now here are in the same unhappy plight, and are in danger of severe punishment—even expatriation—from the Duke John at Zweibrücken ; and indeed there is no less an upset in religion than in the Palatine Electorate.' [3] Duke John had at first signed the ' Formula of Concord ' in the character of a strict Lutheran. Then he ' changed,' and in 1588 introduced a new catechism teaching Calvinism, to which he himself wrote a Preface with a warning ' against the terrible idolatry of the papacy.' Under pain of punishment he commanded all his subjects to conform to this catechism. He went from one administrative centre to another and laid his new symbol of faith personally before all the clergy. While before he had declared ' Lutheranism alone to be in conformity with the Scriptures,' now all who stuck staunchly to it were ' turned out as obstinate pates.' When Jacob Andreä and Johann Pappus warned the people in public writings against ' the dangerous venom ' of the new

[1] Sudhoff, p. 426. [2] *Warhaftiger Bericht*, iii.
[3] *Klage und Wehgeschrei des armen Volkes*, p. 19.

catechism, John issued a decree on December 12, 1588, ordering that all and any persons in whose possession such writings should be found, were to be 'put in confinement;' he would treat 'such lying calumniators as they deserved,'[1] he said. Caspar Salm reports the Duke to have said: 'The ruling authorities have the Spirit of God, and according as God is pleased at different times to enlighten the rulers, their servants and subjects must be ready to follow this Spirit, for the Spirit of God blows where it listeth.'[2]

In the upper Palatinate the old contentions began anew between the government and the Estates, who 'were determined not to budge from their Lutheranism and who would not give in to the Administrator Casimir's orders for making over some of the churches to Calvinistic preachers.'[3] 'Abuse and insults from the pulpits, cursings and execrations of the preachers one against the other, grew daily worse and worse,' and it was a common thing 'to hear said among the people that the churches had become so many temples of infamy.'[4] Consequently, 'the beer-houses came to be the places most frequently attended, and with the decline of all Christian life, brutish swilling, adultery, and blasphemy increased with every year.' 'Excessive beer-drinking,' said John Casimir on August 10, 1584, in a circular pamphlet for the upper Palatinate, 'is in full swing among the common people, with the result of unseemly squandering of the gracious gifts of God,

[1] [Faber] Stoff, ii. 151–156, 195–197; *Entwurf einer Kirchen- und Reformations-Geschichte*, pp. 33–34; Salm, *Klage*, p. 20.

[2] Salm, *Klage*, p. 21.

[3] Fuller details in Wittmann, pp. 72–82.

[4] Salm, *Klage*, p. 23.

together with all sorts of blasphemy, murder, profligacy, lasciviousness, and reckless, godless immorality.' [1]

The fight against Calvinism assumed a still more bitter character among the people after an attempt had been made to convert the town of Neumarkt to the Calvinistic doctrine by starving it out. In January 1592 a regular insurrection had broken out there, and the town had been overcome by a surprise attack.[2]

It was not only religious acrimony or fear of the 'seemingly uninterrupted progress of Calvinism among the Estates of the Augsburg Confession,' which caused the ever-increasing virulence in the language of Lutheran theologians and preachers against the Calvinists; a still deeper reason for this bitterness lay in the intense disgust felt for 'the eternal intrigues and conspiracies of Calvinistic princes and towns among each other and with foreign potentates, which never allowed the Empire and the people a moment's peace.' 'Such intriguing and conspiring,' we read in a leaflet of the year 1592, 'are verily an utterly un-German symptom and departure, and what they will lead to for the beloved Fatherland we shall indeed experience with sorrow and lamenting; and even if God in His mercy averts the catastrophe in our own day, our children and children's children will nevertheless come in for a baptism of blood. In all these troubles, however, those of Palatine race are always the leaders and movers and the prime lords and masters.' [3]

[1] *Verhandlungen des histor. Vereins von Oberpfalz und Regensburg*, pp. 22, 112.

[2] Wittmann, pp. 86–87.

[3] *Fürbitte eines Exul Christi, dass Gott dem heiligen römischen Reiche Friede und Einigkeit schenken wolle* (Anonymous, *Einblattdruck*, without locality, 1592).

CHAPTER V

INTRIGUES OF PROTESTANT PRINCES WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES—FEAR OF THE POPE AND THE JESUITS—THE EMPEROR'S HELPLESSNESS, 1584–1586

THE Count Palatine John Casimir had begun his robbing—and plundering—expedition in the archbishopric of Cologne in 1583 in defiance of the most stringent imperial orders, and in his summons to war he had openly mocked the Emperor by representing him as a victim of priestly artifices on whose behalf he was bound to take up arms.[1] He had then possessed himself of the will of his late brother Louis and had acted in direct opposition to its provisions, with open defiance of the rights of his co-guardians, and without regard to the orders of the Emperor and of the Imperial Chamber. And yet Rudolf II., on May 20, 1585, had appointed him, 'his dear uncle and Prince,' Administrator of the Palatinate.[2] 'The wicked and the disobedient,' Duke William of Bavaria complained concerning the Emperor on July 22, 'are treated with indulgence, while the obedient and pious get no protection, and justice lies prostrate.'[3]

John Casimir was encouraged in 'fresh intrigues in the Empire' by the proceedings in France.

On June 10, 1584, the Duke of Anjou and Alençon

[1] He sent the Emperor back his letter torn open (v. Bezold, ii. 118).
[2] v. Bezold, ii. 266.
[3] v. Bezold, ii. 274.

had died without leaving any children. His brother, King Henry III., the last scion of the House of Valois, was living in childless wedlock, and thus the extinction of the House was close at hand. 'In France,' wrote Theodore Beza on July 11, 1584, 'all eyes are turned on King Henry of Navarre, the next heir now to the French throne. The King is very careful to evince his goodwill towards him.' The papists, he said, would probably everywhere use all their power to avert the threatened misfortune.[1]

Henry III. seemed intending to throw himself completely into the arms of the Huguenots, who constituted a regular state within the state, a republic always prepared for battle in the midst of a powerless monarchy. In January 1585 a solemn embassy from the Dutch provinces in revolt against Spain waited on him to offer him the governorship, and if he did not at once accept the offer, he at any rate allowed his chancellor to negotiate with the ambassadors, himself gave them audience in spite of the remonstrances of the Spanish messenger, and presented them with gold chains. Delegates from the English Queen Elizabeth, who conferred on him the Order of the Garter, met with a brilliant reception from him. These proceedings, coupled with the prospect that in Henry of Navarre a Calvinistic king would mount the throne, threw the Catholics into the deepest consternation, and Philip II. reckoned that the time had come for entering into alliance with the Guises, the heads of the Catholic party, and once more requiting the French court for having so often supported the insurgents in the Netherlands. In the middle of January 1585 a League was

[1] v. Polenz, iv. 285.

formed for hindering the accession of Henry of Navarre. According to the recognised law of France no heretic could be king; not Henry, therefore, but his uncle, the Cardinal of Bourbon, must receive the crown. In France also and in the Netherlands Calvinism must be suppressed and the Catholic religion be established as the only ruling one. France must henceforth renounce all alliances with the Turks and with the pirates of the Indian seas. All that Henry possessed beyond the French frontiers must fall to the Spanish king.[1] 'No greater misfortune can happen,' said the Leaguers in a proclamation in the middle of April, 'than for an heretical prince to ascend the throne; for the people will neither recognise nor submit to the authority of a ruler who has apostatised from the Christian-Catholic faith; the principal coronation oath which the kings take is that they will maintain the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, and it is on the security of this oath that the subjects swear fidelity to them.'

Henry of Navarre had resolved to secure the succession by force of arms, and before the proclamation had been issued by the League he had already in March instructed his ambassador Ségur to obtain from John Casimir the largest possible number of cavalry and infantry.[2] Elizabeth of England asked to be informed, on April 10, what was the shortest time in which the Count Palatine could levy a sufficient number of mercenaries, both horse and foot, for resistance against the Pope; she promised to send him the necessary money at once. The Pope's intention, Elizabeth represented to the

[1] Ranke, *Französische Gesch.* (2nd ed.), i. 402–404; L'Epinois, *La Ligue et les Papes*, p. 8.

[2] Berger de Xivrey, ii. 21.

Protestant Electors and the King of Denmark, was to subjugate all kings, princes, and towns to himself, and for this purpose he was equipping a powerful army, whose first performance would be the extirpation of the Huguenots. All Protestant powers must therefore unite together in a gigantic league.[1] They must support Navarre at once, John Casimir wrote to Elizabeth on May 27, 1585, and at the same time consult about the League; the Protestant princes must send plenipotentiaries; two months after the arrival of the money 10,000 cavalry and 10,000 infantry would be ready to march; negotiations were already on foot with Saxony and Brandenburg, and also with the Swiss; Elizabeth herself, he suggested, might effect the co-operation of the Hanseatic towns.[2]

Among the measures adopted for 'stirring up the princes and Estates to war against the Catholics was an atrocious, scurrilous lampoon'—so Jost Vossens, an officer of the Elector of Mayence, reported—'which was manufactured at Heidelberg and sent to the Estates of the Empire, and printed both in Latin and German. It bore the title, *Eine sehr notwendige, treuherzige und wohlgemeinte Warnung und Vermahnungsschrift*[3]—to all Electors, Princes, and other Estates of the Realm—and was intended 'to make known the secret and iniquitous plots' which were being hatched against 'the welfare and salvation' of the Empire by Philip II. of Spain, the Pope and the Jesuits, with their German supporters, the Emperor, Duke William of Bavaria,

[1] Sugenheim, *Frankreichs Einfluss*, i. 406, note.

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 268–269.

[3] 'A very necessary, true-hearted, and well-meant warning and exhortation.'

and Ernest, the Elector of Cologne. The Spanish King had already overmastered the rest of the world, and he wanted to lay the Empire also under his terrible yoke, and to establish the Roman religion everywhere by the power of the sword. That this monarch, by right of his lordship over the Burgundian Circle, should possess a seat and a vote at the Diets and in the Imperial Chamber was more detrimental to the honour of Germany than anything else, and made the German princes, with their own will and knowledge, subservient to Spain. 'How, then, can Germany be regarded as otherwise than utterly miserable and unfortunate, when the King of Spain, if he chose, could rule and govern it at his own pleasure? But why do I say that he could if he chose, when it is patent to everybody that he does already bear rule at his own will and pleasure far and wide in Germany?' 'I say nothing of the fact that those people who "pull the wires" of the Roman crown and sceptre, by reason of the hopes which they have founded on the Spanish monarchy, will nevermore set themselves in opposition to the power and dominion of Spain.' The young Bavarian Prince, Duke Ernest, thanks to the Spanish King, 'has gathered to himself such strength and power that nearly all German princes have reason to be afraid of him:' the Archbishopric of Cologne was a 'pathway and bridge' for the King of Spain with the Empire. Through Philip's influence the Pope and the Emperor 'had promised and guaranteed to the Archbishop of Cologne the Bishopric of Magdeburg also—the very core and heart of Saxony.' The Archbishop was to be Primate over the whole of Germany, and to parcel out all ecclesiastical offices, dignities, and benefices according to his pleasure. What

fearful bloodshed would be caused if the House of Bavaria, always full of hatred and envy towards the Palatine race, were to raise anew its claims to the Electoral dignity! Philip II., who already virtually ruled the whole Empire, was an incestuous villain and a filiocide, and by the 'doctrine and rules of his religion' and the authority of the Pope he was absolved from all duties. The Pope had given over Germany—Germany under excommunication—to the King of Spain to be 'persecuted by fire and sword,' just as former Popes had delivered up the Fatherland to Charles V. 'to be slaughtered in the shambles.' The author of the so-called official lampoon was not even acquainted with the order of succession of the Popes. He spoke of Paul III. and 'his successor, Clement VII.' These Popes, he informed the world, had excommunicated Charles V., and, forsooth, for no other reason than that, 'instead of putting down and settling the religious controversy by war and bloodshed, he had had recourse to the regular authority of a Christian, general, free council.' The Catholic Estates of Germany also were by no means in a secure position, for the present Pope had good reasons for involving the Spanish King in a war with Germany 'because he sees that those also who conform to the Roman religion, not only do not defend their faith against the Protestants, but also live on good terms with them and are connected with them by many leagues and alliances.' Germans, therefore, had to choose between leaguing themselves with Philip II. for the forcible subjugation of Germany, or combining against him, both among themselves and with France, England, and other powers.[1]

[1] Goldast, *Politische Reichshändel*, pp. 654–670, where the date is falsely

At the instigation of Catherine de' Medici the vacillating Henry III. joined the League in July 1585, rescinded all the concessions he had made to the Huguenots, required them to restore all the fortified places, and decreed in a parliamentary edict that within six months all adherents of the new religion must swear allegiance to the Catholic faith or else leave the country. In a further decree of October 7 he reduced the six months to fourteen days.[1]

Meanwhile, on September 9, 1585, Pope Sixtus V., at the request of the League, had issued a Constitution in which he proclaimed that 'the two Huguenot Princes of the House of Bourbon, Henry of Navarre and Henry of Condé, had been guilty of a relapse into their earlier errors, that they were avowed heretics, and that they had therefore forfeited all claims to the French crown.'

Against this proclamation of 'Sixtus V., who arrogates to himself the title of Pope,' Henry of Navarre caused an Appellation to be placarded in Rome, and in November issued orders that not the clergy only but all the inhabitants of the towns in which the Emperor's decree of October 7, 1585, had been carried out, should be deprived of their possessions.[2] 'Levy as much cavalry as you can,' Henry had written to Ségur on August 19, before the papal proclamation; 'exert yourself to obtain as many Swiss as possible; get the help of the King of Denmark and of the Christian Princes, and raise a second army.' John Casimir was

given as 1537; see Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 49, note 5, and 143, note 2. This letter of Vossen (March 21, 1586) which I have just quoted, and which lies before me, confirms Stieve's assumption that the libellous pamphlet was composed by a councillor of the Palatine Elector.

[1] v. Polenz, iv. 314–316; L'Epinois, *La Ligue et les Papes*, p. 21.

[2] v. Polenz, iv. 347; L'Epinois, *La Ligue et les Papes*, p. 29.

to be solicited to take over the chief command of the German troops; this war was the most important one of the whole century. Already in 1583 Henry had wished for a foreign army and for a fleet commanded by English captains. In May 1585 he had written to Elizabeth: 'Whereas your Majesty takes the first place in this undertaking, I proffer myself as your commander-in-chief against the allied enemy.' [1]

The report spread through the Empire by Henry and Elizabeth in 1584 of a 'huge Papal League for the subjugation and extirpation of the Augsburg Confessionists' had by no means found credence at that time with the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg. The Emperor had warned them against Navarre and had solemnly declared that 'he should be true to his duty, and that as a German Prince, and a Prince of the House of Austria, he should be more mindful of what was his duty than to enter into alliances in the Empire for the purpose of suppressing or doing violence to his co-estates.' Threupon the most reassuring answers had flowed in from Dresden and Berlin. In especial, John George of Brandenburg had expressed the thoroughly loyal sentiment that 'he had never had any inclination for leagues and alliances, especially those that hailed from France.' A letter from the Queen of England remained lying in the Berlin Chancellery, docketed 'Unanswered.' John George was convinced that Navarre's 'business was being pushed on entirely by the Calvinists for their own advantage.'

In 1585 John Casimir and William of Hesse applied to him for information respecting the extensive plans

[1] Berger de Xivrey, ii. 51 ff., 119–121, 127; Duplessis-Mornay, i. 417 ff.

of the League and the efforts which the Jesuits were said to have made at a Polish Imperial assembly on behalf of a confederation. The Elector answered that 'it behoved them all to live as much as possible in good faith towards one another in the Empire, and not to give the papists occasion for combining against them.' [1]

In Dresden, on the other hand, before the expiration of the year 1585, 'the Palatine-Franco design' received the long-wished-for support of the Elector Augustus.

On October 1 the Electress Anna had died.[2] If public opinion had been severe on her husband for not having once visited her during her seven weeks' illness, from fear of infection, it appeared 'to everybody still less right and proper' that he 'should be able so quickly to forget the faithful companion of so many years, and, although sixty years old, barely a month after her death, on November 9, betroth himself to the thirteen-year-old Princess Agnes Hedwig of Anhalt. It was settled that the marriage would not take place till the end of the year of mourning.' 'But such was the impatience of the grey-headed lover' that this interval was not observed.[3]

[1] Droysen, ii.[b] 347–348.

[2] Concerning this interesting woman, see the articles 'Eine deutsche Fürstin des 16. Jahrhunderts,' 'Ein Kulturbild,' in the *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 98, p. 333 ff., 450 ff., 512 ff.

[3] See Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch.* i. 644, who points out that with the rest of the Protestant princes there was also an 'unconquerable disinclination to the widowed state,' that 'Prince William of Orange, for instance, contracted four marriages, one close upon the other;' that his brother 'Count John's hasty departure from the post he had undertaken in Guelders was partly connected with the fact that the forty-four-year-old man, after losing his first wife, and after the expiration of the year of mourning, wanted to marry again immediately;' and that when 'the pious Elector Frederic III. became a widower after thirty years of married life, only a year and a half elapsed before this man of fifty-four led to the hymeneal altar the handsome widow of the Count of Brederode.'

The wedding took place as early as January 1586, and in honour of the occasion the youthful Electress and her father, Joachim Ernest, obtained from Augustus the promise that Peucer should be released from his twelve years' captivity.[1] Only in the summer of the preceding year Peucer had expressed to the Superintendent Selnekker and the Vice-chancellor Schilter, who had been ordered by the Elector to impart to him 'the true understanding of divine teaching,' his deep-seated aversion to the 'Formula of Concord.' He had assured them that he had personally received 'a special revelation from God,' according to which 'it was commanded and enjoined on him no less than on Ezekiel' to proclaim that 'all the articles' of this formula 'were corrupt at bottom,' and were departures from the divine truth of the Augsburg Confession and the Lutheran Catechism: in the doctrine of the Eucharist, Luther had been a papist.[2] When, in spite of this declaration, Peucer was liberated on February 8, 1586, the adherents of the 'Formula of Concord' became alarmed at what might be the consequence, and caused a medal to be struck representing Adam and Eve under the forbidden tree, with the electoral coat-of-arms at their side, and the inscription:

Adam durch der Eva Rat
Gottes Gebot übertrat.[3]

'The Elector of Saxony,' wrote the Earl of Leicester, 'is a changed man since his marriage,'[4] under the double influence of his young wife and of his father-in-law,

[1] See our statements, vol. viii. 193 ff.

[2] *Selnekkers und Schilters Berichte bei Hutter*, pp. 69b–74.

[3] Tentzel, *Saxonia numismatica*, i. 197.

[4] Passages from the letters of Leicester, in Sugenheim's *Frankreichs Einfluss*, i. 407, note 103.

Joachim Ernest, who was a supporter of the reformed religionists—especially of Henry of Navarre. John Casimir also, of old so harshly condemned by the Elector on account of his foreign intrigues, now gained his father-in-law's ear. The Count Palatine wrote his opinion to Augustus on December 23, 1585, that the Catholic Estates would certainly not at present attempt to denounce the religious pacification or to act in open violation of the treaty; for all that, some of the ambassadors at the last Diet had publicly declared the Religious Peace to have been annulled by the Tridentine Council.[1] Moreover,' John Casimir went on, 'the Pope would certainly hesitate to take any steps of the sort until he had finally suppressed and rooted out the new religionists in France; for otherwise it would be a hard matter for him to pull off the whole tail of the horse with one tug.'

There had been of late 'numbers of special transactions,' however, which warned them to be cautious in the extreme: such as the appearance of papal bulls and the imposition of new ecclesiastical oaths, which all received additional force from the 'newly resumed ceremonies of unction.' To wit, on August 12, 1582, at the Diet of Augsburg, the Elector John of Treves had received episcopal consecration at the hands of the cardinal legate and of two bishops, and this was regarded by the Protestant princes as a papal encroachment on their rights.[2] The rumour current in the Empire that the Pope meant to excommunicate the

[1] In reference to a statement of the Jülich ambassador, who, on the occasion of a division on the affairs of the towns, asked at the Augsburg Diet of August 17, 1582: 'Whether the towns were included in the Interim Religious Peace?' (v. Bezold, i. 507, note 2).

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 296, 300-301.

Protestant Electors and rob them of their dignities was also used by John Casimir to terrorise Augustus. He gave him this information for what it was worth, Casimir wrote, but it had gone the round of the Imperial Court and, 'as he had learnt from distinguished papists,' there could be no doubt whatever as to the Pope's will and intention; but the proclamation of the sentence of excommunication had been postponed by the advice of a few of the older cardinals until the issue of affairs in France was known. In the general sentence of excommunication annually proclaimed on Maundy Thursday, and posted up a year ago in the archbishopric of Treves, 'the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians were first on the list.' If the Pope succeeded in carrying out his intentions all over France, nothing would restrain him from excommunicating the Estates of the Augsburg Confession also, and from taking possession of their territories. There would be plenty of tools at hand for the work, if not in the Empire, at any rate abroad, in Spain, Italy, and in other countries; the ecclesiastical and other popish Estates would also join in the game.[1] 'Very trustworthy news' was already current in Augsburg to the effect that 'several papist Estates held a bond for one million and eight hundred thousand florins, and trustworthy persons had seen a document with the autograph signatures of the three ecclesiastical Electors,

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 316–318. Instead of 'Corpus Christi day,' 'Maundy Thursday' must stand. The rumour of the Pope's intention to depose the secular Electors may have been strengthened by indiscreet utterances of the Catholic party, especially of the secret convention of the three spiritual Electors, and the Cologne nuncio, Bonomi at Coblentz, in August 1585 (see below). The Pope, under pressure from the Emperor, issued a brief on September 21, 1585, contradicting this report, and forbidding its circulation under penalty of forced labour on the galleys (Zöchbaur, i. 30–31).

containing instructions as to how the Passau Treaty and the Religious Peace were to be got rid of.' [1]

All these 'rumours and tidings' threw Augustus, and likewise the Elector John George of Brandenburg, into great consternation. Augustus sent for Ségur, King Henry of Navarre's ambassador, and informed him of his willingness to join with the other Protestant princes in supporting the King and the French Calvinists.[2] On January 18, 1586, he and John George addressed to the Emperor a 'memorandum concerning the attacks of the League on our beloved Fatherland.' [3]

In this memorandum the Jesuits were described as the principal members of the League, and an 'incident' that had happened in Prague was brought forward as a proof 'which must make it more than plain to the dullest eyesight,' that their intention was 'to exterminate the whole body of Augsburg Confessionists by sword and bloodshed.'

This 'incident' was 'a painting' which the Jesuits of Prague published in the year 1585, and had dedicated to the Emperor and to all the Knights of the Golden Fleece.[4] The picture represented the vineyard of the Lord, encircled by the chain of the order, and defended against wild beasts by the Knights, especially the Emperor, the Kings of Spain, and the Archdukes. Appended to it was a song of praise to those who protected the Church against heretics and against the Turks.

[1] Droysen, 2^b, 349.

[2] Sugenheim, *Frankreichs Einfluss*, i. 407–408.

[3] Droysen, 2^b, 349.

[4] The Emperor and the Archdukes Charles and Ernest were invested with the Order of the Golden Fleece at the beginning of June 1585; see Zöchbaur, i. 29.

Doctor Lucas Osiander, court preacher of Duke Louis of Würtemberg, drew public attention to the fearful significance of this painting in a 'warning against the bloodthirsty designs and wicked intrigues of the Jesuits.' 'In this picture,' he said, 'Satan has let the sharp claws of his dear and faithful Jesuits peep out, and we can no longer be ignorant of the way in which they have hitherto intrigued and manœuvred to enable the highest secular potentates of Christendom to overwhelm the evangelical Estates of the Augsburg Confession, and to exterminate the evangelical faith.' If the Jesuits 'got the game into their own hands they would without doubt deal with all Protestants alike, and massacre every individual who refused to recognise the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ, or who refused to worship him as an earthly God.' All who refused to partake in 'their idolatry' had been 'fore-ordained to death' by the Pope. 'This murderous business was to be commenced at the selfsame place where the Augsburg Confession had been composed and handed in.' The proofs of this bloody design were 'secret letters, which the Jesuits wrote clandestinely to each other,' and if necessary 'the originals could be produced.' Further evidence consisted of two new 'Discourses,' which 'without doubt were not unknown to the Jesuits,' and in which, among other things, it was said that 'all monks and priests' were to be ready to serve in the war against the evangelicals. As a third proof of 'the bloodthirsty heart of the Jesuits' it was stated that they had 'gone in a clerical procession, armed with muskets and other weapons.' And, fourthly, it was rumoured that bands of 'Jesuits had traversed Germany on post-horses and in other ways, decked out with gold chains and other

aristocratic apparel, in order that they and their machinations might pass unchallenged.'

These proofs were sufficient. 'Therefore,' says Osiander, 'it is not to be doubted that if the Jesuits could drown Germany in its own blood, they would do so, and, moreover, that they will do their very utmost to compass this end.' And hence it followed that 'the Jesuits must indeed be cruel, abominable, and bloodthirsty people.' They were children of Satan, postboys of the devil, emissaries of the Pope, who was plotting a general massacre of all pious Christians, and who intended to set up a gruesome slaughter-house in Germany.

The Catholic Estates were warned by Osiander that all who supported the Jesuits and their party and strengthened the dominion of the Pope were driving, not at a slow trot, but at full gallop, into the jaws of hell, and were encouraging all sorts of abominable sins, 'just as if anyone were to take a tyrant into a burgher's house, and were to watch and handcuff the burgher, in order that the tyrant might be free to dishonour his wife and children.' [1]

When Duke William of Bavaria complained to Duke Louis of Würtemberg of the slanders of his court preacher, which had sown mistrust between the Estates, he received for answer that 'Osiander's warning was thoroughly justified and very necessary.' [2]

'Osiander abuses us all over Germany,' wrote the Viennese Jesuit, George Scherer, to Duke William on January 1, 1586, 'as though we were intent on bloody designs and intrigues, and were peace-breakers, agitators,

[1] Osiander, *Warnung*, i. 5, 7–11, 14, 17, 24.

[2] Sattler, v. 95; see Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 150–151

murderers, assassins, and heaven knows what else in the way of bloodthirstiness. And he makes it his business also to excite the suspicion of the Estates and princes of the Augsburg Confession against the Catholic potentates, just as if the latter were intending to form a new league, a new alliance on the sly, and as if they meant to be disloyal and treacherous, to annul the general Religious Peace, and to surprise the Lutheran princes with armed forces and massacre them. He warns all the magistrates to take timely precautions, not to go to sleep, not to neglect the necessary measures.' And your Graces can well conceive, with your great and princely intellects, that the effect of all Osiander's writing on the world of to-day, with all its varying tempers and opinions, will be to excite the Estates and the municipal authorities to practise oppression on innocent people, and to awaken distrust between the various rulers. The Christian secular authorities will not need my directions as to what in such a case they ought to do and to leave undone. To us Jesuits, however, it has not seemed fitting that we should remain silent under such terrible accusations and injurious calumnies; we felt bound, on the contrary, to proclaim our innocence publicly in a full and truthful counter-statement. And we have done this, not for our own personal justification—for, for ourselves, we ought to bear this, and more even, with Christian patience—but in order that the Holy Gospel, which we preach in the orthodox manner throughout Christendom, be not stained with unmerited disgrace, and that the progress of the divine Word be not hindered in the minds of many who would only too gladly believe all the false reports circulated concerning us by our calumniators.' Scherer dedicated to the Duke, with

this letter, his pamphlet: '*Rettung der Jesuites Unschuld wider die Giftspinnen Lucam Osiander.*'[1] He insists in it that Osiander should bring forward proofs of his charges. 'How can you prove,' he asks for instance, 'that a Jesuit has written a secret letter to Augsburg concerning the suppression of the Augsburg Confession there and through the whole of Germany?' 'Let us hear the exact, unfalsified words of the letter.' What is this Jesuit's name? Where does he live? To what

[1] Ingoldstadt, 1586. Concerning the Prague picture, Scherer says that it only points to defence against invasion and plunder. 'If you had rightly examined this representation of the Christian Church, against which you write so fiercely, you would have understood that the Jesuits of Prague did not depict his Imperial Majesty and other princely and exalted personages as hunting down the wild beasts, seeking them out in their holes and dens, falling upon them unawares in their habitations; but that they only painted them in the characters of watchmen, guardians, advocates, and protectors of the vineyard, resolutely keeping at bay or driving off the wild beasts that poured from all quarters out of their dens and habitats, and made furious onslaughts on the vineyard, causing much injury and disaster. What injustice is there in this? In what sense is it wicked? Is not necessary self-protection permissible? Is not defence allowed by natural laws as well as by statutes written and enacted? Why else should emperors, kings, princes, and lords exist? Osiander mine, just listen awhile to the advice which Luther gives his followers with regard to the Pope, who was to him as a bear and a dangerous wild beast.' Scherer then quotes a string of Luther's most virulent utterances (pp. 15–18, 22–24). 'And, Osiander, since you refer to the Latin verses on both sides of the painting, just tell me if there is any syllable in these verses which is meant to apply to the Augsburg Confession or to the Lutheran princes and Estates? You say no word about the Turks, to whom allusion is expressly made in the lines:

> Carolus hinc plenis contortam viribus hastam
> In fera Turcarum bellator viscera mergit.

You are mute as a stone in this respect, while you go on babbling about Lutheran princes and Estates of the Augsburg Confession, concerning whom there is nothing whatever in the verses. I shall not mention any picture against the Catholics, although many hundred thousand of them, most disgraceful and seditionary, have been printed by your party, both in the time of the Emperor Charles and down to the present day, as is well known to everybody' (pp. 13, 15, 21).

college does he belong? To whom has he written? You raise an outcry about this letter, as though murder were in it, and you can't even verify your statements with a single syllable.' 'Yea, verily, had you found the smallest word in it that referred in any way to shedding of blood, you would not have kept silence about it: you would have had it printed in the very largest type.' As for the 'Two Discourses,' one of which came before the eyes of the people seventeen years ago, he asks of Osiander, 'Who composed these discourses? What have they to do with us Jesuits? However shameless you may be, you dare not go so far as to say that such dialogues emanate from us Jesuits. All you say is: "Undoubtedly this discourse is not unknown to the Jesuits." A most convincing proof this from a learned doctor and a court preacher! How if both these compositions had been conceived and concocted by your own self in order to bring more and more odium on us and on other Catholics? as indeed happens daily.'

All the rest of the evidence, moreover, adduced by Osiander, consisted of such phrases as, 'It is reported, according to various communications, that the Jesuits undoubtedly know all about it; without doubt this is what the Jesuits are contemplating; it has come to our certain knowledge,' and so on, and so on. 'These are the strongest proofs in the whole of your miserable libel.' 'In future, when you want to write books, and to bring such heavy indictments against Jesuits—indictments which strike also at the supreme sovereignty and at other Christian rulers, you will do well to give chapter and verse: give the exact words, designate the particular book, name the author; tell us the what, how, when, wherefore.' 'So far from true is it that

we had in our minds anything like that you accuse us of, that every Jesuit among us would be ready, were it possible, to lay down a thousand lives for the welfare and salvation of the Lutheran princes. And would God that your pious princes were more accurately informed concerning our vocation and doctrine, our preaching, our schools, our doing and living, than to believe all the false reports with which you fill their minds in every imaginable way. They, as well as many other pious, upright, Catholic princes, would then undoubtedly feel more friendly respect and liking for us, and would not be so easily embittered or prejudiced against us by you preachers—you whose unutterable hatred of us Jesuits proceeds solely, as you know full well, from the fact that we are fully aware of all your tricks and artifices, and that we are able to uncover and make known to the people all the hypocrisy, deceit, and snares which you hide under the beautiful cloak of the Gospel. You write and rave with all your might against the Jesuits, and always and only against the Jesuits; you invent all the falsehoods and lies against them that you can think of. Whatever of evil happens all over the world, the Jesuits must have done it. Yea, to such an extent do you thirst after our blood, that you would rejoice if all the Jesuits throughout Christendom were pitilessly massacred in one day or night: this is plain to see from the preface of Georgius Nigrinus to the fourth book of Kemnitius.' 'What right have you to accuse the Pope and the Jesuits of sedition, bloodshed, and murder, when you yourselves have no dearer aim than to organise an insurrection by which we all shall be destroyed and rooted out? Verily it is not in the *will* that you preachers are wanting, but your

bloodthirsty designs and machinations are being checked and hindered by a special dispensation of Almighty God, so that they will not ripen into effect. And, moreover, the inborn moderation and goodness of the genuine Lutheran princes is such that you will not succeed in obtaining from them what you want by your inflammatory, peace-destroying sermons, nor by your seditious pamphlets and treatises.' 'We Jesuits can with a cheerful conscience reply to you heretical preachers and ranting agitators, that it is not we who are creating disturbance in Germany and upsetting the peace, but that you yourselves are the guilty fellows. For what are all your sermons and books for the most part but *Huss, Huss, Dran, Dran* against the Pope and his followers? as indeed many of the more reasonable and intelligent Lutherans themselves complain.'

'If the Calvinists got the sword in their hands they would tolerate no single Catholic far and wide. God knows how it would fare with the Lutherans. For though the Calvinists prate of nothing but peace, tolerance, and freedom of religion when they are down in the world, as soon as they get up again, the only freedom they recognise is that everybody must either turn Calvinist or else pack off with wife and children: it's the only way for them to escape with life and whole skins.' [1]

'In juxtaposition to the Protestants leagued together by all manner of plots and confederacies, the Catholic Estates,' so Duke William of Bavaria complained, 'stood powerless and divided.' He expressed the wish that the more important of the Estates, at any rate, should confer together concerning measures of defence

[1] Scherer, *Rettung*, pp. 26, 31, 35, 46–47.

in case one or the other of them should be attacked or oppressed by the Protestant Estates in violation of the Religious Peace; for 'these people,' he wrote, 'will not desist, and sooner or later, when the Catholics are off their guard, and when they least expect it, the Protestants will surprise them with an attack.' 'It is open and plain to see,' the Duke urged on the ecclesiastical Electors assembled at Coblentz in August 1585, 'how greatly the Augsburg Confessionists are on the alert with their plots and conspiracies, endeavouring by one dangerous intrigue after another to annul the Religious Peace, and then completely to subjugate the Catholic Estates: this is clearly shown by the latest events in Strasburg, Halberstadt, and Minden. It would not, however, be advisable at the present juncture to plan any new alliances and thus give the Protestant Estates cause for fresh uneasiness; they had best confine themselves to strengthening anew the Landsberg Defensive League, which had already long been known to the Protestants. If the three ecclesiastical Electors would agree to join this alliance, a more secure position would be gained for the Catholic Estates without attracting any attention.' [1]

The Landsberg Defensive League had never exercised any important influence on the affairs of the Empire, and at that time it was 'almost a shadow.' In 1584 Duke Ferdinand of Tyrol had withdrawn from it, Nuremberg had followed his example, and it was only with difficulty that William had prevented the Archbishop of Salzburg doing the same.[2] The spiritual

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 288, 289. With regard to the want of unity on the Catholic side, see also Zöchbaur, i. 37 ff.

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 230, 294; Hirn, ii. 145, 196.

Electors, paralysed by fear, would not 'consent to anything:' not even when, at the beginning of 1586, the Elector of Mayence stated at the Worms assembly of deputies that he was strengthened in his conviction that 'the one aim and intention of the Palatine and his party was still as heretofore—only with fiercer resolve—the complete suppression of the Catholics, and first and foremost of the ecclesiastical bishoprics and archbishoprics.' [1]

In a letter to the Emperor the Elector pointed out the great danger of the manœuvres which the Calvinistic party carried on at the assembly of deputies, under the leadership of John Casimir. They not only entered an emphatic protest against the validity of decision by majority of votes, but they also held special meetings at which they arranged and cooked-up their votes against the Catholics, obstructed the passing of measures proposed by the imperial plenipotentiaries, and 'declared openly that the ecclesiastical reservation was an extorted article, not finally settled, which must be annulled, if a breach was to be avoided; as long as it remained in force they would not contribute a penny or a farthing.' Helpless and in despair the Emperor asked Duke William how 'to prevent such danger and indecorum,' for it was evident that 'the Palatine mind was bent on nothing short of the complete suppression of the Catholic Estates and the introduction of Calvinistic errors, on the abolition of everything in the shape of obedience, order, and legislation, but above all on doing away with the imperial dignity and authority.' When, however, the Duke hinted at the only prudent means of defence, viz. the

[1] It was thus that Wolfgang of Dalberg, Archbishop of Mayence, spoke, according to the letter of Vossen, quoted above, p. 110, n.

strengthening of the Landsberg defensive alliance, the suggestion was firmly rejected in the imperial palace. 'The sword alone,' said William, 'will keep the other sword in its sheath.' 'If the Protestants were to see their adversaries armed and ready for resistance, they would not embark so lightly on their enterprises; in the present state of things, however, with our clergy wholly defenceless and our lay supporters few in number, they will most certainly strike one fine day, and make trial of their luck.' The imperial Vice-chancellor Vieheuser, on the other hand, said it would certainly be well for the 'Catholics to make themselves ready for defence,' but that Rudolf II. 'would never consent to a defensive alliance of all the Catholics.' Duke William wrote to the Archbishop of Salzburg on December 5, 1586, that the most distressing want of unity prevailed continually among the imperial councillors; each detested the other; some of them were not personally disinclined to the Church innovations, but the better disposed ones were full of extreme apprehension.[1]

At the imperial palace of Prague it was now the fashion, even in regard to the most important political questions, 'to let things go as they liked, and to be content with wordy fulminations;' for they were so hard up for money that they were often unable to despatch a courier, and would gratefully accept the offer of the Fuggers of Augsburg to let their commercial agents carry the despatches of the imperial cabinet to Madrid or to Rome.[2]

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 410–415. In Roman circles Vice-chancellor Vieheuser was credited with 'a chronic antipathy for all persons and things Roman' (v. Bezold, *Rudolf II. und die heilige Liga*, p. 362, note 1).

[2] See Hübner, ii. 28.

'The burning question,' so the Tuscan messenger Urbani reported from Prague in 1586, 'is the choice of a King of the Romans.' 'Never was unity between the head of the house and its members more essential than at present, but how far removed we are from it! The Archdukes are contending with one another for the succession in the Empire. Each of them has come forward as a candidate. The Emperor hesitates. Everybody asks, and nobody knows, if and when this election will come off; but the Emperor preserves profound silence on the subject.' Constantly occupied with the thought of his marriage with the Spanish Infanta, Rudolf kept up an uninterrupted correspondence with Philip II. on this matter, and he never informed any of his ministers of the letters that came to him from Spain, but employed his private secretary to answer them. 'If the Protestants, as is supposed, have their eyes fixed on the King of Denmark, no one believes that they will succeed in carrying through the election of a heretic.' The opposition of the Catholics and the division in their own camp, where all the different sects are busy fighting each other, will cause the plan to make shipwreck. 'What they wish for is a Catholic ruler, provided he be a feeble one, so that the Empire may die, as it were, of protracted fever, and thus give them the necessary time to increase their strength and add to their power and influence from day to day.' [1]

John Casimir had another plan. His aim was to prevent an election taking place during the Emperor's

[1] October 28, 1586. Hübner, ii. 25-26. Concerning the importance of the question of the succession, see the case admirably stated by Zöchbaur, i. 17-18. The Emperor's attitude in this question is also excellently criticised here (p. 23). For the candidatures of the archdukes, see Zöchbaur, i. 25 ff. and ii. 38 ff.

lifetime, and to manage that there should be an interregnum, and then, if possible, raise the Calvinistic King Henry of Navarre to the German throne.[1] His object was the annihilation of the Habsburg dominion. 'If the Empire departs from Austria,' he said hopefully in the year 1586, 'the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary will also come to nothing.'[2]

While the Emperor was helpless, halting and undecided, and the Catholic Estates in a condition of utter powerlessness, John Casimir went on drawing false pictures of the serious evils to be expected from them. The Emperor, he said, in violation of his capitulation, was involved in lawsuits in the Empire and was interfering unconstitutionally in matters of religion; he was employing his commissioners to incense the town populations against their municipal authorities, and endeavouring to subdue the towns to himself by ordering them—the Catholic ones, that is to say—not to recognise any councillors of another religion. He was also filling the bishoprics with men of his own party, intriguing with Poles with a view to 'striking some future day at the Elector by means of the Jesuits,' and lending a hand everywhere to the tyranny of the King of Spain. He should be made to restore everything that Austria had wrested from the Empire, all that she was still purloining from day to day. The ecclesiastical Electors were in conspiracy with the Guises and would gladly have procured the crown for the latter 'in order afterwards to have France on their side against us, not to mention other veiled designs.' 'The priests

[1] '*Ob nit*,' it says in his memorandum book of 1586, '*ad interregnum und künftig ein König von Navarra*' (see Zöchbaur, i. 32). ('Should there be an interregnum and then a King of Navarra?')

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 323. See above, pp. 12–13.

were breeding so much iniquity with Austria that a free election would be quite impossible, and the best plan would be to let things come to an interregnum.' Besides all this the ecclesiastical Electors and the other bishops were marked with the 'sign of the Beast,' for they had allowed themselves to be 'chrismated and smeared,' and they had followed the Emperor's lead in accepting the Pope's new Calendar. 'Only think what tribulation Mayence has brought on the knights of Eichfeld for the sake of religion, and how Würzburg treats its knights: examples, Hutten and Grumbach.' '*Nota bene* how the *Jesuzuwider* [the Jesu-withstanders] are settling themselves in the Empire by force, and how the nobles are entrusting their children to them, traitors that they are to the Fatherland.' 'The Pope has established a Jesuit school of his own at Fulda, and he maintains it at his own cost.' The Jesuits were compassing all sorts of villany everywhere, and in Germany they circulated pictures and printed matter in depreciation of the Protestant Estates; and the extent to which they had got hold of the Catholic Estates was shown by the case of the Duke of Bavaria. 'It is necessary,' he reiterated later, 'either that there should be another head, or that there should be an interregnum.' He would come to an understanding on the matter with Hesse and Brandenburg, and influence Saxony by their means.[1]

[1] v. Bezold, ii. 323–327. Häusser, *Tagebuch*, p. 390 ff., 406–407, 409.

CHAPTER VI

A 'CHRISTIAN MILITARY EXPEDITION AGAINST FRANCE —TRANSACTIONS FOR THE FORMATION OF A PROTESTANT SEPARATE LEAGUE—IMPOTENCE OF THE CATHOLIC ESTATES, 1586–1591

In February 1586 the Elector Augustus of Saxony had died. His successor, Christian I., 'a very wine-bibbing lord and a great lover of the chase,' made over all 'the control of religious and other affairs of the State' to his privy councillor, Nicholas Krell, a man of Calvinistic opinions and a friend of John Casimir. Since then Saxony had become 'a favourable soil for the promotion of Calvinistic Palatine-Franco intrigues.'

In October 1586 the Protestant princes sent an embassy to the French King, Henry III., to demand that he would revive the decrees enacted in favour of the Huguenots. The ambassadors, however, received a blunt dismissal, and this affront stimulated the princes to still more zealous partisanship of Henry of Navarre. On December 24 the Margrave Joachim Frederic, Administrator of Magdeburg, roused the Elector of Saxony to military ardour. He represented to him that, through the action of France, Germany also would probably be enabled to achieve results against the papists. The monstrous repudiation of the embassy, he wrote, made it imperatively necessary that they should render assistance to the French Calvinists. True,

there was no great danger to be feared for the Protestants in the Empire, for the papists would not 'so lightly embark on active measures.' But they must bear in mind what might possibly happen if the present peace-loving, popish Electors and princes were removed by death, 'and were succeeded by others more warlike and ardent who should pursue their evil designs with fire and sword.' Even now there was a determination to appoint no more evangelicals to the higher benefices, and the right of the evangelicals to seats and votes at the Diet was disputed. 'In the cause of God Almighty' they had a right to use the sword, just as of old the Kings of Israel had maintained the law of Jehovah by the sword. There was no fear that their coming forward to support the evangelicals in France would provoke the papists to counter-action, for when formerly they had rendered help to the Calvinists, the Catholics had made no open resistance, but had, on the contrary, taken flight. King Henry of Navarre seemed to be called by God 'to overthrow completely the idolatrous papacy in the French kingdom,' and it was of the utmost importance for Germany that there should be a reformed King in France, for then the Catholics would no longer dictate the tune, and they would be able to confront the latter with united forces. Thanks to the 'means employed' by the Elector Maurice in 1552, the Protestants 'by a special divine dispensation' had procured the Religious Peace, which they would not otherwise have been able to obtain. And now again there was an 'equally favourable opportunity' for securing much good. 'For even for this end are children chastised, that they may become godly, and by means of chastisement they are often brought to a state which

they would never have attained otherwise. For all these reasons they were in duty bound "to advance God's glory," to break up the kingdom of Satan, to save posterity from still greater danger, and to revive the ancient terror of the German nation.'[1]

In January 1587 John Casimir concluded a treaty with the plenipotentiaries of Henry of Navarre to the effect that '150,000 imperial florins were to be collected, the greater part from the English Queen Elizabeth and from the Protestant imperial princes; and that with this money he would contribute an important German contingent to the King's forces.'[2] The Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg and other Protestant Estates allowed free levying for Henry in their territories, in spite of the imperial prohibition, and also granted their nobles leave to join the Navarrese army. John Casimir, however, did not himself undertake the chief command of the troops, but committed it to the Prussian Burgrave, Fabian von Dohna, who realised the Magdeburg Administrator's desire for 'the revival of the terror of the German nation' in such a fashion among the brethren of the Teutonic Order in Alsace that 'children's children can still recount his doings.'

In the month of July about 8,000 German cavalry and 5,000 Landsknechts assembled under Dohna on the plains of Alsace, and were reinforced by 13,000 Protestant Swiss mercenaries and 4,000 Huguenots under the command of the Duke of Bouillon. While the Swiss preserved good discipline, the Germans and the Huguenots plundered and levied contributions for full six weeks all over the plain country. More than

[1] Goldast, *Politische Reichshändel*, pp. 612–616.
[2] Duplessis-Mornay, iv. 56 ff.

300 villages were burnt to the ground. A peasant wail ran as follows: (' *Klagelied der Bauern im unteren Elsass und Kaisersperg.*')

We people are forsaken all
In Alsace far and near;
Strike, then, ere greater woe befall:
The time is truly here.
Seize arms each man, the best he can,
Pole, pitchfork, flail, or hoe—
Think not of making show.
Forsaken are we everywhere,
By all the rulers of the land,
In this our danger and despair;
No slight disgrace their names will brand.

In an order sent to Dohna the Emperor had most strictly forbidden the levying and assembling of military forces, and had ordered the troops to be disbanded. But Dohna, as 'Field-Marshal of the Royal Majesty at Navarre,' signified in a despatch that he had no intention of obeying, but that he should continue his march to France, for he was waging war against the presumptuous might of the Pope, who claimed the right of disposing of all kingdoms of the earth according to his own pleasure, and who also intended to use violence and coercion against the princes of the German nation and to destroy both the Religious Peace and the Public Peace. This was sufficient justification for 'the present Christian military expedition.' But, added to these genuine and legitimate reasons, 'the kingly Majesty of France' was in debt to the German Reiters for large arrears of money from former wars, and it was necessary to go to war in order to recover this.' [1]

[1] *Warhaffte Erklärung und Entschuldigung der teutschen Obristen, Rittmeister und anderer Befehlshaber und Kriegsleuten, warumb dieselben jetziger Zeit der Königlichen Würden zu Navarra zuziehen. Datum Quatzenheim,* August 10, 1537.

'The Christian military expedition,' owing to the incapacity of the leaders, the constant strife between Dohna and the Duke of Bouillon, and the perpetual contentions between the Germans and the Swiss, had a very lamentable issue. 'Cavalry and Landsknechts were led to the slaughter-house like so many convicted felons.' 'It was a piteous spectacle even for the eyes of the enemy,' writes Davila, 'to see the unhappy Germans who were dropping down in the streets with fever and dysentery, ruthlessly butchered by the French. Among many other horrible cases eighteen men were seen being hacked to pieces with a knife, like miserable animals, in a cottage in Burgundy, by a woman who was taking her revenge for former injuries. Barely a thousand Germans—and those ill and half naked—returned home in December 1587.' [1]

Before long another army of Germans was to be led to the slaughter-house—this time, however, not against, but for the French King. Henry III. had once more changed his policy, and had caused the heads of the League to be put to death; and now, in alliance with the Huguenots, he called for the help of the Protestant princes 'in the evangelical work.' 'We want money from the Germans,' said Henry, 'in order that we may be able to levy troops in the Empire.' At Dresden his ambassadors met with a friendly reception. At an interview in Langensalza the Elector Christian I. and the Landgrave William of Hesse decided, in June 1589, to lend the French King 100,000 florins on condition that 'in similar necessity' they might count on French support. John Casimir and the Administrator of Magdeburg also

[1] Raumer, *Histor. Taschenbuch*, 1838, p. 25 ff.; Vulliemin, *Gesch. der Eidgenossen*, ii. 261 ff.; v. Polenz, iv. 495 ff., 523.

guaranteed money aid.[1] But, before the sums were paid up, Henry III. had been assassinated, and Henry of Navarre profited by the money.

In the cause of the latter two specially active workers were John Casimir and Nicholas Krell, whom Christian I. had raised to the office of Chancellor on June 25, 1589.

But before the new 'redoubtable evangelical military expedition to France' set off, it was necessary to establish a purely Protestant League within the Empire.

The scheme for a league of this sort, which should be lasting 'for all times,' was temporarily arranged on March 2, 1590, at a Diet at Plauen, between John Casimir and Christian I.: the members were forthwith to collect enough money for levying an army of 12,000 in infantry and 6,000 cavalry. To some further demands of John Casimir, Christian would not agree. The Palatine required, namely, that the ecclesiastical reservation should be unconditionally abolished, and that the League should be bound to defend its members 'in the possession and acquisition of bishoprics.' Further, the League was not to confine its assistance to the members, but to support all Protestant claims in the Empire; for instance, to help the Protestants in Aix-la-Chapelle and Cologne against their Catholic lords.[2]

Besides the Landgraves William and Louis of Hesse, the Elector John George of Brandenburg and his son, the Administrator of Magdeburg, the Margrave George Frederic of Ausbach and Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick, who was also Bishop of Halberstadt, declared themselves willing to join the Protestant League. On the other hand, Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg announced that he could not enter into any alliance with men who

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 12–13, 24. [2] *Ibid.* i. 32–34.

were not adherents of the Augsburg Confession and the 'Formula of Concord,' and who were not included in the Religious Peace. Moreover, he wrote to the Elector of Brandenburg, he had no intention of mixing himself up in foreign quarrels and bringing himself and his subjects into difficulty by troubles which others had brought, or might bring, on themselves. It was quite unnecessary, he said, to organise special leagues and confederacies for the management of secular affairs, seeing that ample provision had already been made in the statutes and ordinances of the Empire for affording succour from the circles to any Estates who might be oppressed or in danger.[1]

According to an agreement entered on at Plauen, the Palatine Elector and Saxony and Brandenburg sent a deputation to the Emperor in June 1590, and their 'grievances' were laid before His Majesty in tolerably vehement language. The disturbances in the Empire were attributed to the 'peace-hating intriguers' among the Catholics, who declared the Religious Peace to be only 'an interim,' and who were intent on subverting all peace and tranquillity in the Empire. The validity of the ecclesiastical reservation was resolutely contested, and freedom of worship demanded for the Protestants in Catholic territories. If 'the objectionable state of things was not improved,' *i.e.* if their 'grievances' were not redressed, the Emperor was warned that at the next Diet, which was soon to meet, 'nothing satisfactory would be accomplished, and a great deal of trouble would possibly arise.'[2] In addition to this

[1] Muffat, pp. 1–7; Helbig, pp. 294–297.

[2] Häberlin, xv. 412–429. The Palatinate and Saxony had combined into a separate Protestant league at Plauen on March 2, 1590. See Zöchbaur, i. 38.

threat, the draft of the 'Gravamina,' which was Casimir's work, contained the following passage which had not been approved at Dresden: 'Furthermore, it could hardly be considered wise on the part of the Estates of the Augsburg Confession if, in case they should be *de facto* further oppressed, in defiance of common right, and of the Religious and Public Peace of the Roman Empire, they resolved to seize their opportunity and consider how they might protect and assert their rights conformably to the constitution of the Empire.' [1]

On August 3, 1590, the Emperor gave the ambassadors an answer, entering in detail into the different grievances.[2]

With regard to angry and offensive objections made against the Religious Peace by particular individuals, he said his refutation was to be found in the contents and text of this treaty of peace, which was a perpetual compact. He himself should observe this Peace inviolably, not picking out only such articles of it as might be the most agreeable or the most supportable to this or the other person, but the whole charter of peace with all its articles, points, and clauses. The ecclesiastical reservation was one of these, and he had sworn an oath to maintain this article inviolate as well as all the others. With regard to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, both lay and clerical, who were subject to Catholic princes, these princes had declared that they had never thought of prescribing in the slightest degree to the Estates of the Augsburg Confession how they were to deal with their subjects, and they should therefore expect the same treatment themselves; the Emperor

[1] Helbig, pp. 297–298.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 297.

could not remember, he said, any occasion on which a Catholic Estate had raised a complaint against an Estate of the Augsburg Confession for having restrained his subjects in matters of religion. The Electors must therefore see that it would not be reasonable or suitable for him, the Emperor, to impose restrictions on the Catholic Estates in matters which were left free to the Protestants, but that he was bound to exercise impartiality towards both sides.

The Electors had also introduced among their grievances the unequal distribution of imperial levying-patents: some, they said, were allowed to recruit for foreign co-religionists, others were forbidden to do so. Moreover, the Emperor must bear in mind that patents from him were by no means necessary for conferring the right to levy soldiers or to enlist under a foreign ruler. Attempts to bestow this privilege on the Emperor had indeed been made at several Diets, but they had never succeeded, for it was felt that such a measure was contrary to traditional German liberty. The Electors, however, expressed their gratitude to the Emperor for having bluntly refused patents to the adherents of the French League and for having told the Elector of Saxony, both verbally and in writing, that 'no Estate of the Augsburg Confession should have cause to join in any outcry or suspicion against him.' On this last point Rudolf answered that 'he should continue to stand by what he had said concerning the question of the League, and that he should not mix himself up in the slightest degree with any such foreign quarrels, which were only productive of all sorts of unpleasantness for the Empire.' He was convinced, he added, that the Electors would agree with him in this, and would prefer

the peace and prosperity of the Estates of the German nation to any foreign intrigues.[1]

The Electors meanwhile proceeded to further negotiations with Henry of Navarre.

John Casimir was still intent on the accomplishment of the aim he had had in view from the beginning of the Cologne war, viz. to involve the Empire in a war with Spain—still exhausted from the defeat of the Armada—and to amalgamate the interests of Germany, France, and the Low Countries in one combined action.

After the defeat of Gebhard of Cologne, two of his adherents, Count von Neuenar and General Martin Schenk of Niedeggen, had entered the service of the States General, and kept up a systematic war of devastation against the archbishopric of Cologne and the bishopric of Münster.[2] Hollanders and Spaniards fought together for the possession of strong places on the Rhine. The Circle Estates were not strong enough to withstand these plundering raids, and they had addressed the most piteous appeals to the Emperor. The latter, however, was scarcely in a position to keep the Turks at bay, and all he could do for the afflicted imperial circles was to make promises, to give them words of encouragement, and to send commissaries to them. When on June 16, 1590, he ordered the Duke of Parma to leave the imperial territory without further delay and to demolish the bulwarks and fortresses which

[1] Häberlin, xv. 429–441.

[2] Fuller details in [Färber's] *Geschichte der Familie Schenk von Niedeggen, besonders des Kriegsobersten Martin Schenk* (Köln und Neuss, 1860). See also Pieler, p. 110 ff., and the *Aufzeichnungen des Kölner Kartäuserprior Johannes Reckschenskel*, edited by Sauerland from a Treves MS., and published in the *Korrespondenzblatt der Westdeutschen Zeitschr. für Gesch. und Kunst*, 1887, vi. 165 ff.

he had erected, he was answered that 'Spain had only yielded to the pressure of necessity; she had not been able to endure that her enemies the Dutch and the English should gain a firm footing in the Empire, should establish bulwarks in its most vital parts, and thus supply the Protestants with a safe basis on the Rhine for their attacks against the Catholics.' [1]

At an assembly of imperial deputies at Frankfort-on-the-Main, at the end of September 1590, the Emperor sent injunctions to the Estates to support negotiations for peace between the two mutually hostile powers that were harassing the Empire. The Catholic majority was willing to carry out this behest. The ambassadors of the ecclesiastical Electors said that 'the attempt to recover by force the German places which had been conquered would give rise to many difficulties, for they had to deal with two powers experienced in war, whom they would draw down upon them: it would not be possible to carry through a long-protracted war.' The ambassadors of the Protestants, on the contrary, rejected all idea of accommodation, and insisted that armed action must forthwith be commenced. In the council of princes there was the same division of opinion. The Protestant Estates would not submit to the majority; at the special instigation of John Casimir they broke up the meeting. 'What is going to become of the Empire in the end? Everything is tending to ruin,' wrote Kaspar von Fürstenberg, the ambassador of the Elector of Cologne.[2]

[1] Ennen, v. 295.

[2] In his memoirs Fürstenberg says among other things: 'October 5: We began to discuss the imperial proposal, *tumultuantibus satis et discrepantibus votis, dum nos Catholici pacem, Lutherani arma vociferantur.* October 10: To-day the resolutions of the Prince of Parma and the States

After the dissolution of the assembly John Casimir bestirred himself energetically to bring the contemplated Protestant Special League to a conclusion. On November 24 he agreed with the Elector Christian, at Dresden, that those princes who had already been won over should send their councillors to Torgau on January 19, 1591.

Krell urged emphatically on the Saxon ambassadors that the Union must be concluded for a term of thirty years at least, that the amount of the members' contributions should be fixed at once, a depot for the money established at Leipzic, and an army raised, which in case of need could be increased to 12,000 or 15,000 men. John Casimir must be appointed Commander-in-chief, and have unlimited authority in military matters; with regard to artillery and other requirements of war,

were read out, and there is hope of a more peaceful state of things for the Empire. . . . October 18: We sit in council again, and propose to set the three Protestant Electors a comprehensive task against the vote of the Catholic Electors. *Bone Deus*, how devoid of all shame they are, *vere juxta D. Pauli haereticorum descriptionem.* October 19: We Catholic councillors of the electoral prince meet in conclave and come to an understanding together against yesterday's infamous and harsh proposal from the Lutheran electoral councillors. October 21: Consultation was held on the resolution of the imperial commissioners and the proceedings were most turbulent. October 25: To-day, when the electoral council wanted to refer to and consult with the council of princes, three of the secular ambassadors in the electoral council refused to take any further part in the proceedings, and protested at the same time that they would not be bound by any Recess. *O summa indignitas! Quo tandem imperium ruit? Deplorate ad interitum vergunt omnia.*' Looking back on the year 1590, Fürstenberg writes: 'Hoc anno ex mense Septembri per Octobrim talis Francofurti me presente conventus Imperialis Deputationis, ut vocant, habitus est, cujus similem Germania, prout credo, longa vel nulla Imperii aetate viderit. Tantum enim ab inveterata et laudabili observatione discessum est, eaque in suffragiis contentio, immodestia et animorum disjunctio causante Io. Casimiro palatinatus administratore visa est, ut vix credam, posthac non solum administrandae reip. et justitiae, sed etiam creandi et constituendi imperatoris modum seu formulam superesse' (Pieler, pp. 134–136).

consultation must be held at the fitting time. As soon as these matters had been agreed about, the rest of the Protestant princes, and the imperial cities also and especially, might be drawn into the League.[1] John Casimir instructed his councillors to act with decision at Torgau. In so important a matter it would not do to show fear and hesitation, even though the proceedings should displease the Emperor or others, or should give rise to disparaging judgments; the Emperor was everywhere on the side of the adversaries, so that the evangelical Estates must not trouble themselves about what pleased him.[2]

At the beginning of February the draft of the League was laid before the Torgau assembly, and in it the members of the League were described as the 'peace-loving Estates;' it was 'imperatively necessary,' the document declared, 'that they should put themselves in readiness for opposing vigorous resistance to the violators of imperial statutes, and for maintaining their rights and privileges.' The sole objects of the League were the strengthening of the Religious and the Public Peace and all statutes of the realm, the preservation of unity in the Empire, and the maintenance and propagation of divine truth, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession and the apology thereof. Temporary agreement was arrived at concerning the organisation of the League; the final settlement was reserved for the princes, and to the latter also were left all transactions concerning the accession of the princes, of the imperial cities, the provincial towns, and the counts.[3]

The question of supporting Henry of Navarre also

[1] Helbig, pp. 307-308; Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 40.
[2] Muffat, p. 8. [3] *Ibid.* p. 13 ff.; Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 44 ff.

came under discussion at Torgau.' In October 1590 this king had pledged himself, in the event of obtaining the French crown, to supply the Estates who had befriended him, in case of need, with 2,000 cavalry and 6,000 infantry.[1] The Saxon Chancellor Krell was as assiduous as John Casimir 'in carrying on intrigues' for Henry of Navarre, declaring that 'the Empire could not remain much longer under papal dominion.' 'We must have a new Emperor,' he is reported by a treasurer of the Saxon Elector and a general to have said, 'and we must establish a new system of government in the Empire.'[2] At the Torgau assembly he proposed that an army of from 5,000 to 6,000 cavalry and 8,000 infantry with twenty-five pieces of field-artillery should be raised for Henry, and that it should be put under the command of the young Calvinist prince, Christian of Anhalt. The army was to be got together in strictest secrecy; the Protestant Estates were to bear the costs, paying them out of the contributions of money which Elizabeth of England had promised. The Netherlands were also to be solicited for help, so that the Spaniards might be kept occupied as much as possible during the campaign.[3] The business of collecting the recruiting moneys cost an immense deal of trouble; it was not till August that Prince Christian had succeeded in mustering at Hochheim an army of some 6,000 cavalry and 9,000 infantry.[4]

On January 17, 1591, Doctor John Pistorius wrote to Duke William of Bavaria that, although he had no further detailed information concerning the contemplated League, it was nevertheless 'certain that they intended

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 24.
[2] Kiesling, pp. 107–109.
[3] Helbig, p. 312.
[4] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 23.

to use all their power in favour of Navarre.' 'It is astonishing to me that we on our part look on so passively at the matter, and that we do not take like measures for defence. It is a great work that they have embarked on, and one which, if God does not take more fatherly care of us than we do of ourselves, will press heavily upon us and bring us into serious misfortune.' [1]

The Catholic Estates, against whose 'peace-destroying intrigues' the Protestants pretended to be obliged to protect themselves, were now, as before, frightened, divided, and powerless. In the year 1590 Bishop Ernest of Bamberg [2] withdrew from the Landsberg Defensive League 'from fear of his neighbours.' In the following year, at Munich, they had not even the courage to decide on holding a meeting of the Catholic Estates in order to draw up a reply to the petition of grievances which had been addressed to the Emperor by the temporal Electors in 1590: such a step, it was feared, might 'provoke an attack on the part of the Protestants.' [3] The Catholics imagined that tranquillity could be secured in the Empire by means of 'an amicable compromise' and a union of the 'peace-loving' Estates of both religions. Bavaria was again anxious that the Landsberg League should be strengthened by the accession of Lutheran princes and imperial cities, in order to disarm the suspicions 'with which the Catholic Estates were regarded by certain turbulent agitators.' In the summer of 1591 the zealous Catholic, Adolf Wolf von Gracht, called Metternich, a canon of

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 11, note 1.

[2] See the monograph of Metzner, *Ernst von Mengersdorf, Fürstbischof von Bamberg* (Bamberg, 1886).

[3] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 16–17.

Spires who had been educated by the Jesuits in the German College at Rome, addressed a memorandum on the position of affairs to Duke William of Bavaria, who had a high opinion of him as a statesman. The Protestants, he wrote, must be conciliated and won over by friendly despatches, deputations, and visits. Intercommunication of this sort would make it possible to neutralise evil and sinister attacks by timely explanation and contradiction, to remove the prejudices entertained by the Protestants against the Catholics, and possibly also to convert many of them. In order to avert the danger of one Estate after another being molested by turbulent people, and of the Empire being thrown into confusion by contempt of the Emperor and of the laws of the realm, the Catholic Estates must combine together for defence against all aggression of this sort, must choose a leader, and collect funds. They must further appoint paid officers who should be empowered to nip in the bud all attempts of hostile persons to levy troops, by imprisoning or slaying some of the leaders, and also to relieve promptly any Estates who should be unexpectedly attacked. This League should be open also to all Protestants who were lovers of peace, and to these it should be represented that the Catholics were only combining thus from necessity, and that they had no further intentions than to defend the laws of the Empire, and to prevent a rule of violence being instituted by those turbulent people who were becoming more and more masters of the Empire. By an announcement of this nature they might easily make the League attractive to everybody and silence the suspicions of their fellow Estates.[1]

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 12-13.

When Duke Charles III. of Lorraine, a member of the French League, made proposals to William of Bavaria and the Archduke Ferdinand for the formation of a league, he was answered with a refusal. The formation of a league of defence, Ferdinand said in March 1591, would certainly be most beneficial for the Empire, 'for the Protestants were banding together almost daily in fresh confederacies, organising all manner of secret leagues and all sorts of odious and preposterous schemes for the suppression of the Catholic religion, the extirpation of the whole body ecclesiastical, and the abolition of all police regulations; and in their arrogance and contumely were even aiming at wresting the sceptre from the Emperor.' But such a union must in no way be mixed up with the French League; it must confine itself to being a confederacy of peaceable Estates, and from the outset it must be open also to Protestant Estates: but first and foremost the participation of the Emperor must be solicited. More emphatically still than Ferdinand the Emperor declared that a defensive alliance must confine itself strictly to defence, and must keep well clear of all foreign quarrels. As head of the Empire, he said, he was bound to foster a good understanding between the different parties; and, moreover, he had already promised several of the Electors not to enter into any special alliance without their knowledge.[1]

No Catholic League of Defence, however, came into existence, although nearly all the Catholic Estates apprehended an attack from the Protestant revolutionary party.

Several of the strict Lutheran princes, who possibly

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 22–26.

were gradually coming to see through 'the Calvinistic intrigues,' raised a strong protest against the Torgau transactions with regard to a Protestant League. Among these were the Dukes Henry Julius of Brunswick and Louis of Würtemberg.[1] The Elector John George of Brandenburg informed the Emperor on August 29, 1591, that 'whereas he realised the serious and extraordinary nature of the occurrences which were succeeding each other in the Empire,' and saw how 'dangerous to the latter' these were, 'so that the nation seemed on the brink of ruin,' he, as the oldest of the Electors, 'could not quietly allow the Empire to be brought into a still worse condition than that in which he had found it, and that he could not relax the efforts for its preservation which he had always hitherto made.' That France, as John Casimir, William of Hesse, and Krell asserted, was the bulwark of freedom and religious independence in Germany, he, the Elector, would not acknowledge.[2]

'The honour-loving Christian princes of the Augsburg Confession,' wrote the Weimar councillor Joachim Reinhold on December 9, 1591, 'were gradually frightened off by the Calvinists, for they could not but see and hear how unjustly and cruelly the simple-minded Christians of the true faith were being treated in Saxony by the Chancellor Krell, who was instigated by Satan.'[3]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 47; Muffat, p. 13 ff.
[2] Droysen, 2^b, 356–357.
[3] To Dr. Karl Hundhausen in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

CHAPTER VII

CALVINISM IN SAXONY AND ITS DOWNFALL—METHOD OF POLEMICS BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE CALVINISTS IN THE NORTH OF THE EMPIRE—COLLAPSE OF THE INTENDED PROTESTANT LEAGUE

EVER since the marriage of Augustus of Saxony with the daughter of the Calvinistic prince, Joachim Ernest of Anhalt, the strict Lutherans had entertained fears that 'the "Formula of Concord," the establishment of which had cost such untold pains, and to which all preachers, schoolmasters and officials had subscribed by oaths, would now be abolished, and that Lutheranism would by degrees go to pieces.'[1] This apprehension was verified soon after the accession of Christian I. under the administration of Nicholas Krell. This all-powerful Chancellor at once procured from the Elector the issue of a so-called 'peace mandate' in which the 'Formula of Concord' was not even mentioned, and by which the preachers were enjoined henceforth to discontinue their 'snapping and snarling' at the Calvinists from the pulpits. Against 'the popish abominations,' however, although there were no longer any Catholics left in Saxony, they were left free to vituperate and 'to follow the leading of the Holy Spirit without fear of hindrance or punishment.' Those

[1] Joachim Reinhold, in the letter quoted at p. 148, note 3.

who refused to conform to this edict were no longer to be tolerated in the Electorate. In order to silence the voice of the adversaries, it was proclaimed that no writings on religious matters were to be printed without permission from the Elector. At the court, in the Universities, in the parishes, Krell sought to fill all public posts with secret Calvinists, and all opponents were bundled out of the land. His chief supporters were—in Dresden, the court preachers, Salmuth and Steinbach; in Leipsic, the Superintendents Harder and Gundermann; in Wittenberg, Johann Major, professor of poetry, and Urban Pierius, whom he had appointed to be Superintendent-General and first professor of theology. Major composed scathing verses against the Lutherans, by whom he was accused of having been 'twice condemned to death for coining false money, for perjury, and for forgery.'[1] 'Satan,' wrote the Lutheran Leonhard Hutter, 'was enacting a melancholy tragedy in the churches and schools of Saxony, and was making use of some evil-minded sacramentarians for this purpose. The most important of the men who had shown themselves zealous in maintaining and propagating pure Lutheran doctrine were deprived of their posts and their dignities. The genuine, orthodox theologians were called Flaccians, Exorcists, Ubiquists, Screamers, asses and dogs. Abuse, vilification, imprecations and slanders, too vile to be repeated, were hurled right and left. Even for the saintly Luther they found no better designation than the German Martin, a seditious, violent priest; Salmuth was actually seen

[1] Kiesling, pp. 52-54, 84-85. Major was 'commonly called Höll-Riegel (bolt of hell).' *Unschuldige Nachrichten zum J. 1707*, p. 770. Concerning Salmuth, see *Allgem. Deutsche Biographie*, xxx. 274.

once at a banquet throwing a glass of beer at a portrait of Luther, and heaping other offensive insults on his memory.' The 'Formula of Concord,' Hutter goes on to say, was actually called a 'disgusting abortion,' and it was even declared openly that the doctrines of the Christian religion were expounded more clearly and perfectly in the law-book of Justinian than in the original version of the Augsburg Confession.[1]

The court preacher Mirus, who warned his hearers vehemently against Calvinism and attacked the Elector personally from the pulpit, was imprisoned in the Königstein.[2] Krell informed his friend the Count Palatine John Casimir that he should 'soon settle accounts

[1] See Kiesling, pp. 22–25. George Mylius, in his *Synopsis Comoediae Misnicae* (Jena, 1593), was the first to depict the condition of things that obtained after the death of the Elector Augustus. The Lutheran theologians, according to this account, were all insulted in the most infamous manner; Luther himself was called the German Martin, that turbulent, inflexible priest. '*Vidisses tantam in templis vastitatem quantam a religione Christiana in his regionibus propagata nulla vidit aetas.*' 'Tantus erat Ministerii contemptus, ut cum Judaeis aut Turcis pari loco a suis auditoribus pastores fuerint habiti.' 'Par et aequalis in scholis cernebatur vastitas.' 'Lipsiae professorum quidam reperiebatur, quem non puduit dicere Visitatoribus in os, ut monstrent sibi corpus Christi in Coena visendum: tum se praesentiam eius crediturum esse.' Everything was changed by the innovators; neither the old prayers and hymns nor the Catechism were any longer of any value. Old things were discarded only because they were old, new things introduced only because they were new, and this was called *enlightenment*. . . . 'Haec scriptis publicis *Illuminatio* appellabatur, qua saeclum hoc Deus praecipue beatum voluisset' (*Unschuldige Nachrichten zum J. 1709*, pp. 386–391; Strobel, *Neue Beiträge*, ii. 341–342; see also G. H. Goetz, *De Reliquiis Lutheri*, pp. 33–34).

[2] Kiesling, pp. 90–91. See Hasse in *Niedners Zeitschr. für hist. Theologie*. Mirus demanded, among other things, that the Elector should compel his councillors to come to the castle for confession; 'and he would then examine them thoroughly and report how each one stood with regard to religion.' The Elector refused to do this, because he could not force anyone to go to a particular confessor (*l. c.* p. 332).

with the priests; they would have to dance to the tune of his piping.' [1]

In order that the people also might learn to dance to his piping, he set Steinbach and Salmuth at work to compile a new Catechism which smacked of Calvinistic doctrines; he also prepared a new edition of the Bible with introductions and commentaries, in which the Lutheran tenets were combated, and Calvinistic opinions advocated. When Salmuth, in 1590, handed in to the Elector the first printed pages of the sumptuously got-up Bible, he received a present of 500 thalers.[2] All the same—so the Lutherans asserted—the Elector had said to the court preacher Mirus: 'I'm no Calvinist, and shall never be one to the end of my days: the devil take all Calvinists.' [3]

The people were first made aware of the innovations when the ruling party began a war of destruction against all altars, organs, images, and baptismal fonts that were left in the churches; and when the preachers, under penalty of deprivation, were forbidden the use of the ceremony of exorcism at baptism, which they were told was 'an unnecessary, scandalous, and necromantic rite,' burghers and peasants broke out in furious excitement. In Zwickau there was such a tumultuous uproar during divine service that the preacher had the greatest difficulty in saving himself from being stoned; at Eilenburg the preacher 'was nearly pelted to death with stones and clods of earth;' at Wittenberg the burghers and students stormed the house of Pierius, who

[1] Kiesling, p. 99.

[2] Häberlin, xvi. 130; Henke, *Peucer und Krell*, p. 63. The printing of this Bible was interrupted by the death of Christian, and it only reached the end of the Books of Chronicles.

[3] Kiesling, p. 123.

was supposed to be the principal cause of the abolition of exorcism ;[1] at Dresden a butcher appeared in church, during the christening of his child, with an axe in his hand, and threatened the preacher that if he did not perform the baptismal service in the regular manner, he would chop off his head in the church ; in spite of the magistrates' orders the terrified man went through the ceremony of exorcism.[2] On another occasion, at Wittenberg, things nearly came to a bloody fray during a baptism.[3]

In numbers of churches the old song against the Pope and the Turks was adapted as follows :

Keep us to Thy Word, O Lord,
And through Christ Thy Son destroy
And slay the Calvinistic horde,
Who Thine omnipotence deny.

Baptism too they've desecrated,
Exorcism from it separated:
See how the devil has blinded the folk

Lampoons and caricatures directed against 'the soul-murdering, venomous Calvinists' passed from hand to hand through the country. A representation in sculpture depicted Calvin, and the devil standing behind him with pen, ink, and paper, and underneath the lines :

Always at the Sophist's hand
Beelzebub doth gladly stand,
For this most learned magistrate
Loves a witty advocate.[5]

Krell, as the 'seducer of the Elector,' was attacked

[1] Arnold, ii. 22. [2] Weck, p. 313.
[3] Kiesling, p. 73 ; Häberlin, xvi. 129. See also Heydenreich, p. 187.
[4] In the Appendix to Nik. Selnekker's *Calvinismus redivivus* of the year 1592. See Kiesling, *Beil.* ii. 71-84.
[5] Brandes, pp. 77-79.

with special virulence in rhymes and pasquinades.[1] In a leaflet he was threatened with 'hanging, scalding, and roasting:

> '. . . all martyrdom and torment far
> Too slight for such a villain are.' [2]

In a pamphlet entitled 'Admonition to the Nobles,' which was distributed among the people, the Chancellor was accused of 'open rebellion and treachery to his country.' It was said that he intended to 'exterminate the adherents of pure doctrine in Saxony by violence and bloodshed;' that he was 'nourishing insurrection in his bosom and conspiring with foreign potentates against the Emperor and the Empire; that he meant to join the French and the Turks.' The spirit of Calvinism 'was in itself nothing more than a spirit of murder,' as indeed 'great and famous theologians had conclusively proved, and as daily experience plainly showed.' Magister Johann Modestinus of Jena, in 1576, had established 'the proof from Holy Scripture' that 'the Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, and Calvinists were not Christians, but only baptized Jews and Mohammedans.' Dr. Johann Friedrich Celestinus had with perfect accuracy denominated these 'seditious spirits' as 'shameless, coarse, doltish devils,' as 'slandering and lying devils,' and he had penned the 'God-inspired words:' 'The Sacramentarian spirit is not content to work by means of cunning and lies only, but in true Arian fashion it makes use of the sword also, and endeavours

[1] 'I have these verses in my possession,' says Kiesling (p. 91, note 5); 'but they are so offensively scurrilous and slanderous that I should not like to soil these pages with them.'

[2] Brandes, p. 79. See Häberlin, xvi. 133, note.

to plant and propagate its doctrine and its falsehoods by riots, bloodshed, and violent assaults on churches, pulpit, and council houses, thus demonstrating clearly that it is not only a spirit of lying but also a spirit of murder.' Flagrant examples of this were 'the Swiss war which had been originated without any provocation by Zwingli, and in which he himself perished miserably, and the tyrannical and violent insurrection of the Calvinists in Bremen.' Anyone 'who did not recognise the cruel, dreadful wolf claws of the Calvinists' must be wholly deficient in understanding of the Christian faith, and even 'no longer master of his reason and natural intelligence.' Krell—so the pamphlet went on—was doing his utmost to incense the Elector against the Emperor and the other Estates, and he had been a party to the iniquitous violation of the common laws and the imperial commands in using the good money of the inhabitants of the land for raising auxiliary troops to help the French Calvinists; he was also engaged in suspicious correspondence with foreign rulers.[1]

The Chancellor's work of organising 'a Calvinistic military expedition' for Henry of Navarre in 1591 was carried on without the knowledge of the Provincial Estates, to whom the Elector had promised, in a Recess of October 7, 1588, that he would not 'engage in any wars, leagues, religious unions, or other matters without the consent of the whole province.'[2]

In spite of the 'earnest entreaties of a few loyalists among the Estates' the Elector consented to the raising of a considerable body of auxiliary troops for the army

[1] *Flugblatt* (without date or locality).
[2] See Kiesling, pp. 113-114

which Christian of Anhalt, in August 1591, led across the Rhine to the assistance of Henry of Navarre.[1]

'We imagined a golden century in store for us,'[2] wrote the Calvinist Scultetus, who was on a visit at Wittenberg in the year 1591. 'In France, Henry of Navarre; in England and Scotland, Queen Elizabeth, were full of burning ardour for the true evangel;' in the Netherlands, Prince Maurice of Orange; in the Palatinate, John Casimir; in Hesse, the Landgrave William were most zealous partisans of the Calvinistic cause. In 1586 the reformed creed had been established in the counties of Wittgenstein, Solms, and Wied; in 1587 the Anhalt territories had accepted it; and, in 1588, the counties of Bentheim, Steinfurt, and Tecklenburg. In this year also the Count Palatine John I. had introduced the Heidelberg Catechism into the Palatinate of Zweibrücken, a district which until then had remained Lutheran. In Saxony, Krell hoped for 'complete victory.' 'I have now,' he wrote to John Casimir on August 4, 1591, 'brought the Elector to the point of being in agreement with your Electoral Grace in the matter of religion. I trust, then, that your Grace will now come to an understanding with his Electoral Grace, in order that the presumption of the territorial Estates, should they refuse adherence—as indeed seems likely from all manner of indications—may be properly punished.' But it was necessary also to stop the opposition of the Electress Sophia. She was a decided antagonist of the religious innovations,

[1] Bertram, *Geschichte von Anhalt*, ii. 400, 566. Queen Elizabeth of England had contributed 10,000 pounds sterling to the costs of recruiting (Winwood, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, i. 29).

[2] '. . . aureum saeculum nobis imaginabamur' (Tholuck, *Kirchliches Leben*, pp. 243–244).

'possibly,' wrote Krell, 'owing to the influence of some of her councillors.' 'Watch must be kept on her so that the work we have embarked on may prosper; I myself shall spare no trouble, as I have told the Landgrave of Hesse in the memorandum I have addressed to him.' 'What more I have in view as concerns your Electoral Grace,' the letter ends, 'you shall hear from me anon.' [1]

So confident of victory was Krell on the very eve of his downfall.

In consequence of his immoderate drinking [2] the Elector Christian I. died suddenly on Oct. 5, 1591, in the thirty-first year of his age. His heir, Christian II., was a boy of eight years old, and the next of kin of the Ernestine branch, Duke Frederic William of Altenburg, undertook the guardianship of the realm. 'This was the signal for loud rejoicing in the land,' for Frederic William was an 'inveterate enemy of Calvinistic fanaticism and its diabolical absurdities, and the true-hearted Christians, after their bitter persecution, could now

[1] Kiesling, pp. 99-100.

[2] See Henke, *Peucer und Krell*, pp. 69 and 87, note 20. The superintendent Garth said openly at Freiberg in a funeral sermon on Christian: 'Above all, as is generally known and cannot be denied, his Electoral Grace had a tendency to excessive drinking' (Tholuck, *Kirchliches Leben*, p. 134). The court preacher Mirus, in 1588, remonstrated with the Elector because, at an infant baptism, 'when he was the worse for drink he took it upon him to speak about religion.' The Elector denied that he had been tipsy and had used blasphemous language. When Mirus showed displeasure at this answer the Elector lost his temper and told him 'he must be so good as to spare him such lectures in future, or he would give him an answer which he would feel.' Mirus replied: 'So then your Grace wants to stop the mouth of the Holy Ghost?' To which the Elector: 'Not the Holy Ghost's, but yours,' and when Mirus tried to say something more the Elector showed him the door with the words: 'Be off with you, or I'll teach you to run' (*Zeitschr. für histor. Theologie*, 1848, xviii. 336).

once more breathe freely.' Some of the preachers—so Krell's wife relates—had the *Te Deum* sung in their churches after the Elector's death.[1]

From fear of what might come next, Krell burnt all his most important letters and papers.[2]

Even before the funeral of the Elector the ex-Chancellor ' was put under heavy chains, and soon afterwards he had to submit to the just and godly chastisement of imprisonment in the same ward of the Königstein in which he had so unjustly incarcerated the court preacher Mirus.'

' Numbers of prodigies, portents, wonders and other supernatural occurrences ' had foretold Krell's rule—but also his downfall ; ' women had given birth to toads, and children had been born with moustaches ; bloody swords had been seen in the heavens, and a figure of Christ overflowed with blood ; in broad daylight cries of anguish had been heard in the clouds, and ghosts, seven feet high, had walked through the church at Zwickau during divine service. Satan incarnate had been seen by many people, both young and old, in a variety of different forms, with or without horns ; he had appeared one Sunday afternoon in the market-place at Eilenburg, with flaming horns, had caused terrible thunderstorms, and wrung the children's necks, and everybody had been frightened to death.' It was known to ' all the people of Saxony in what numbers of different shapes the devil himself had appeared to that dear man of God, Martin Luther,' and everybody was acquainted with ' the Satanic arts with which the devil goes about all day long, insinuating himself into houses and plaguing

[1] Richard, *Krell*, ii. 222.
[2] Kiesling, p. 108, note.

people out of their wits, or even taking their lives.'[1] Luther had immeasurably increased the general belief in the power of Satan. In his larger Catechism he taught that 'The devil delights in producing strife, murder, sedition, and war—item, thunderstorms and hail-storms to destroy corn and cattle, and to poison the air, and so forth.' 'Because the devil is not only a liar but also a murderer, he is everlastingly setting pitfalls for our lives, and he wreaks his vengeance on us by overwhelming us with danger and destruction. So, we see, he brings many people to ruin, or else drives them out of their senses; some he drowns in water, others he drives to committing suicide, or to all sorts of other terrible calamities. No hour of the day was man's life safe from the wiles of the devil: his knife, spear, and arrows were directed at us from morning till night.'[2]

After Krell's ministry had been overthrown, the devil, 'as was credibly reported, performed fresh wonderful feats.' 'He visited the captive Krell in his imprisonment several times in the shape of a blackbird, and held conversations with him which were distinctly heard by the guards, although they could not understand the language in which the talkers both spoke.'[3] Oftener still he appeared to Krell's friend, the court preacher David Steinbach, who had been placed in custody in the castle of Stolpen. On June 21, 1592, the governor of the castle, Thomas Leutter, informed the Administrator, Frederic William, that the former court preacher had 'tried to escape from

[1] *Gläubliche und wunderbarliche Berichte von Prodigien und Teufelserscheinungen* (1601), Bl. v. 9.

[2] Collected Works, xx. 121, 127, 154.

[3] *Gläubliche und wunderbarliche Berichte*, Bl. 12.

custody with the help of the wicked enemy:' he had passed through three locked doors, which showed no signs of force having been used, but in the descent from the window he had fallen and broken a leg. 'Of his own accord, without any pressure,' Steinbach, in the presence of the burgomaster, had declared to several magistrates and law officials that 'the devil had helped him in his flight, for he had often come to him in his ward at night, and had washed himself in his basin, and turned over the leaves of his books:' in the courtyard of the castle the wicked spirit had undoubtedly been seen and heard.

Steinbach consented to make 'public recantation of the false Calvinistic doctrines' which he had hitherto proclaimed. He declared in a Recess that he condemned these tenets 'from the bottom of his heart,' and that he would thenceforth conform to the 'Formula of Concord.' For this he received permission to leave the country. The Leipsic Superintendent, Professor Guntermann, after five months' confinement in the Pleissenburg, signed a similar document of recantation and promised to lead a solitary life in his home at Kahla in Thuringia. If ever again he should be tempted to 'mix himself up with doctrine,' he said, 'he would forfeit his body and life to justice.'

On hearing, on his way to Kahla, that his wife, meanwhile, had hung herself, he was seized with instantaneous madness, and 'talked like a man demented.'[1] The court preacher only escaped with difficulty from the rage of the Dresden mob, who began storming

[1] *Widerufff zweier Calvinischer sächsischer Prediger: Dr. Christopheri Gundermann, gewesenen Superintendenten und Professors zu Leipzig, und David Steinbach, Hofpredigers zu Dresden, 1593* 6 Bl.

his house and clamouring for the blood of 'the seductive Calvinistic priest.' He and Pierius, the Superintendent-general of Wittenberg, abjured Calvinism and were then allowed to seek an asylum outside of Saxony. The zealous Lutheran Polycarp Leiser, who had migrated to Brunswick under the rule of Krell, was now recalled to Wittenberg as teacher and preacher. He gained special commendation for having frankly declared in the preface to his Catechism that 'in the hearts of all Calvinists there lurks hidden the Oriental Antichrist, the Turk.'

At the suggestion of the territorial Estates, with a view to purifying the Electorate of Calvinism, it was decided to institute a visitation of churches through lay and clerical commissioners. A formula of orthodox faith drawn up by Government was to be taken round by these commissioners for signature to all preachers, teachers, and officials. Four professors and two members of the Council at Wittenberg, at Leipsic three preachers and eight professors and doctors of the legal, medical, and philosophical faculties, who refused to sign, were deposed from their offices and expelled from the country; several advocates suspected of Calvinism were declared unfit for the practice of law. All the book-dealers of the Electorate received stringent orders to get rid of all the Calvinistic books they had in stock, and not to import or sell any more in the country.[1]

[1] In gratitude for the extirpation of Calvinism in Saxony, Augustine Brunnius of Annaberg, pastor of Jesingen in Würtemberg, dedicated to the Administrator, Frederic William, *Zwölf Predigten*, on the twelve articles of the Christian faith (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1595). Satan, he said, had wrought fearful havoc in the Saxon schools and churches by means of his Calvinistic tools, who had 'deceived, bewitched, and blinded' the Elector Christian I., but by God's marvellous grace he had now been driven out.

To the common people all Calvinists were 'devils incarnate.' The former court preacher Schütz had incurred, under the Elector Augustus, the punishment of perpetual confinement in his own house for being associated with the crypto-Calvinism of Wittenberg. He had died at Dresden in the year 1592, and on the day of the funeral an immense mob gathered outside his house, drove in the windows, and clamoured vociferously for the corpse, shouting out that it ought to be buried under the gallows. It was scarcely possible to remove the body even in a cart. The few mourners who followed were pelted with filth and put to flight. On the way a black hen was suddenly let loose to fly over the cart, and the cry went from mouth to mouth: 'See there, the Calvinistic devil!'[1] Still worse outrage was committed at Dresden on the corpse of a musician of the Electoral Chapel, the Italian Jacob Lossius, who, being a Catholic, had never attended the Lutheran Church service, and who had died without the ministration of a preacher. As he had been refused Christian burial, he was to be carried by four day-labourers in secret to the burying-place of criminals. But a gang of butchers' and smiths' apprentices pelted the coffin bearers with stones and scattered them right and left. 'Thereupon,' says a report, 'they dragged the corpse out of the coffin, set the dogs upon it to tear it to pieces, and smashed the head with a large stone; so that the next day the dead man's brother-in-law had to come with a shovel to gather up the pieces and carry them to the grave. While all this was going on, a party of tipsy peasants from a wedding at Strehlen came

[1] Arnold, ii. 18; Häberlin, xvi. 389; Calinich, *Kampf des Melanchthonianismus*, p. 177.

to swell the mob and beat their drums to the proceedings.' [1]

At Leipsic the dread of all the 'Calvinistic poison' was so great that on November 20, 1592, 'the globe on the church-tower of St. Nicholas, which had been put up by the Burgomaster Backofen, was taken down and examined to see if anything had been hidden in it by the Calvinists.' [2] A Lutheran theologian, in a sermon in the church of St. Thomas in 1592, described the Communion Service of the Calvinists in the following words: 'They set a can full of wine on a little table in the church—a can not unlike those that brandy is sold in—and they sit down at it, pass the can round from one to the other, to gulp down as much as they like; and often they drink such deep draughts that they go away quite besotted.' The author of the dialogue 'Nemesius and Agatho' says: 'This I have heard with my own ears, and have myself seen old women, on hearing the recital of such enormities, making the sign of the cross in order to protect themselves against such sacrilegious behaviour, and crying bitterly over it.' [3]

On May 14, 1593, at a celebration of the Lord's Supper at Leipsic, in the hostel of the Calvinist Weinhausen, there arose a dispute on theological matters between the Wittenberg theologian, Samuel Huber, and the former Wittenberg professor, John Major. Huber, in numbers of different pamphlets, had called the Calvinists allies of the devil, in which capacity, he said, they aimed at bringing about as much misery and evil in the West as the Nestorians, the precursors of Mohammed,

[1] Arnold, ii. 626. [2] Heydenreich, p. 201.

[3] Struve, *Pfälz. Kirchenhistorie*, pp. 492–494. In some comic verses

had wrought in the East: their doctrines were 'the infernal flames of the devil out of the fire of hell,' but God had already 'knocked into their blasphemous throats those grinding teeth of theirs with which they had so furiously attacked the wounds of His only Son.' [1]

For uttering these opinions the theologian, Johann Jacob Grynäus at Basle, and Johann Jeslerus at Schaffhausen, had denounced him as 'a villain, a scoundrel, a vagabond lost to all sense of honour, who deserved to be stuck in the pillory, to be hanged and beheaded; and they had recommended the burning of his books.' [2] Huber had also written against Major, who in return had called him at table a perjured liar; a friend who was present broke out with the threat that he would drive his knife into his body. The incident forthwith became the talk of the whole town, and the people

printed at Leipsic in 1592, there occurs the following description of a Calvinistic Communion Service:

A table in the church they set,
The parson bids the clerk to get
Some wine and bread thereon to spread,
And when the people come, they tread
Around the table, stand there munching
Bread and wine as though all lunching.
The parson in their midst we see,
A jovial boon companion he, ...
And when his turn comes he also
Takes bread to eat and gulps down wine
In such deep draughts that drops of brine
Well from his eyes and overflow.
Then when they've emptied out the cup
The clerk in haste comes running up;
He pours another bumper out,
And straight begins another bout;
The priest and people drinking stay
Till the parson scarce 'Amen' can say.

—Richard, *Krell*, i. 348–349.

[1] Huber, *Von der calvinistischen Prädikanten Schwindelgeist*, Preface and pp. 3, 9.

[2] Huber's *Protestation vom Jahre 1593.* See *Unschuld. Nachrichten zum Jahr 1707*, pp. 766–769.

espoused the cause of Huber. For the next few days notices were stuck up in the markets and the lecture-halls of the University to the effect that 'Everybody with a true Lutheran heart must appear in the market-place at eight o'clock in the evening and help to storm the house of the Calvinist Weinhausen; no true Lutheran burgher would oppose them or put any obstacles in their way.

On the evening of May 19, and on the following Sunday, when the bells were ringing for church, the house was stormed and plundered by the raging populace. 'Seize everything, spare nothing,' cried out a journeyman furrier named Fürst (=Prince): 'take who can; the "prince" has ordered it; all Calvinists are to be treated in this way.' Many people understood from this that Duke Philip of Brunswick-Lüneburg-Grubenhagen, who was then at Leipsic, had given the command, and they set to work all the more vigorously. The mob was also encouraged by the fact that the first burgomaster Sieber and some of the town councillors, who were looking out of the windows of the council house, took no steps to prevent the riots. All the chests and coffers of the house were broken open; money and gold and silver valuables were stolen; the costly household furniture was damaged; all works of art, among others a picture of the Passion by Albrecht Dürer, were hacked in pieces. Towards midday people of all sorts came pouring in from the suburbs and from the country, and the booths of foreign dealers which were erected in the fair were then fallen on and plundered. On the market-place 'the mob had erected a gibbet to hang Weinhausen, who, however, kept himself in concealment. When the burgomaster at last summoned the burghers

to arm themselves, in order to disperse the turbulent pillaging riffraff, they answered him that they would most certainly not help to protect any Calvinists; that only on condition of their being turned bodily out of the town before sunset would they do what befitted obedient citizens.' The council was obliged to obey. A list of condemned names was handed in by one of the burghers, with the result that five members of the council, five doctors at law, one doctor of medicine, five professors and twelve other burghers were expelled from the town before nightfall, with mocking and derision. Meanwhile the pillaging mob had withdrawn to other quarters of the town, but the burghers had by this time got under arms, and they managed to disperse the multitude. On the following day the Administrator Frederic William made his appearance, issued a rigorous ordinance, and strengthened the garrison of Pleissenburg. The inhabitants were all enjoined to set 'buckets of water outside their doors, for the insurgents had threatened to destroy the Calvinists by fire, and, indeed, signs of intended incendiarism had been discovered in some houses.' Four ringleaders of the disturbance were beheaded in front of the council house; thirty others were arrested, and some of them flogged, others banished from the country, while some were set free again on the intercession of friends.[1]

In the presence of the Administrator, George Müller of Jena delivered a so-called 'peace sermon' on Ascension day, in order to reassure perturbed spirits. It was impossible, he said, any longer to put up with the blasphemous doctrine of Calvinism and its bloodthirsty seditious

[1] *Warhafftiger und erschrecklicher Aufruhr zu Leipzig*, &c. (Jhena, 1593) Heydenreich, pp. 204–219, 229.

adherents in the land of Saxony: they should be as little tolerated among true Christians as Jews and heathens.[1] The court preacher Mirus, on the other hand, exhorted his hearers to use moderation, and for so doing was denounced as a Calvinist, and obliged to answer for himself before the Meissen Consistorium.

In order to avert 'a general insurrection' in the land, Frederic William, in July and August 1593, issued several stern edicts against all preachers in the Electorate who, 'as a rule, not only devoted the greater part of their sermons to the subject of Calvinism, but who also made such attacks on the persons of Calvinists, stoning them, ejecting them, and so forth, that the common people everywhere were goaded into bitter hatred against this sect.' They were commanded thenceforth to discontinue their unseemly vituperations. These orders were disregarded by the preachers as well as by the people. They could not—so the Superintendents wrote to the Administrator—see the wisdom of 'an admonition to the preachers not to proceed harshly against the Calvinists. By such a step he would not only strengthen the Calvinists in their wickedness and error, but he would set the common people against their own pastors—whom he would be bringing into contempt for the sake of Calvinism—and he would stir them up to bitter hatred of, and all sorts of iniquitous proceedings against, the ministers set over them.' 'Whereas the mischievous, accursed, and damnable heresy of Calvinism was corroding all around it like a cancer, and spreading itself all through the land, they were bound in sincerity and honour to exhort the Administrator to give his attention as much as possible to the rooting

[1] Richard, *Krell*, i. 152–153.

out of this Calvinistic poison of souls.'[1] They referred him to a pamphlet by John Wigand, where it was said: 'The Sacramentarians commit intolerable sacrileges, they rob Christ of His divine omnipotence; their spirit is one of deadly hostility to the Lord Christ; they will do nothing but mock, revile, and degrade Him so long as they are left in existence.'[2]

'All Calvinists, papists, Jews, and pagans must be rooted out:' so ran the watchword. The following lines were disseminated:

Christ Jesus with the Christians,
The devil with the Calvinists.
Thus from Luther we have learnt;
The *Jesuwiters* must be burnt,
The monks must be roasted in the flame,
The nuns must be taken to houses of shame.[3]

'As is the case in the Saxon Electorate,' a priest lamented on Easter day 1594, 'so too in all neighbouring lands and towns in these evil latter days, a spirit of hatred, stirred up by the devil, is raging between Lutherans and Calvinists, and anybody who for the sake of the poor, purblind, infuriated people, counsels moderation and peace is hooted down and persecuted.'[4]

In the former Dominican church at Erfurt, the so-called nine o'clock preacher, whose business it was to preach the Word of God to the lower classes, almost invariably preached against the Calvinists, although there were none of them in the town: he called them martyrs of the devil, warned male and female servants

[1] Häberlin, xvii. 447–453.

[2] *Ursachen, warumb christliche Obrigkeit und Gemeine die sakramentierische Lehre und Lehrer nicht leiden sollen* (Königsberg, 1585).

[3] Richard, *Krell*, i. 349.

[4] A sermon preached on Easter day 1594, by M. Jakobus Schirmer in the church of St. Nicholas at Nordhausen.

against their books as strongly as against the devil himself, and described the book-dealers who trafficked in such publications as servants of the devil. Another preacher, Caspar Teuder, spoke out on the Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity 1590, against this habit of reviling from the pulpit. Brought to book for so doing, he said that he had felt constrained by his conscience to make a stand against the unchristian cursing, but that, at the bottom of his heart, he was hostile to all Sacramentarian fanatics, and that he held by the Augsburg Confession and 'the Holy Catechism of Luther.' All the same he was suddenly deposed as a crypto-Calvinist on account of this sermon, and expelled from the town with his wife and children. After this it became a yearly custom 'to have a thanksgiving festival on the Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, and to celebrate the expulsion of this man in the Dominican Church with drums and other signs of rejoicing.' [1]

At Nordhausen, Johann Pandocheus, pastor of St. Nicholas, was of opinion that it was pernicious to the true religion to be always attacking the Calvinists from the pulpit instead of proclaiming Luther's doctrine. 'The Calvinists,' he said, 'make numbers of people believe the scandalous doctrine that God has created many people for everlasting damnation; it is not His intention, they say, that all who hear His Word should receive it and be saved thereby; Christ also did not die for all mankind; the elect, however, even though they should fall and sin abominably, do not lose the Holy Ghost.' These shocking doctrines were now being 'stated from the pulpit before the simple-minded congregation with unedifying fervour and much more

[1] Arnold, ii. 624–626.

generally than the doctrines of Luther or of other learned persons. Consequently, 'the uneducated masses' had remained ignorant of Luther's true doctrine. 'It was considered Calvinistic of me,' he wrote, 'to have said that "people ought to go regularly to church, and not lightly despise any sermon, for we did not know at what hour it might please the Lord to enlighten our hearts through His Spirit"—though these are Luther's own words.' Pandocheus called Luther a 'holy man,' 'the new Elias,' and yet the Lutheran zealots denounced Pandocheus as a godless apostate. Johann Rieger, preacher at the Frauenberg at Nordhausen, informed the magistrates in several letters that Pandocheus was 'a blasphemer, Luther's undutiful son; the devil rode him, and he was himself a devil.' For four whole years, Pandocheus complained in 1596, Rieger had 'plagued him almost to death' with his sermons. 'Whoever says any good of me is told that he stands with one foot in hell; even the children in the streets have learnt to abuse me as a Calvinist.' [1] The theologians of Helmstadt took up the cause of Pandocheus. 'Oh, you poor distressed souls at Nordhausen,' they wrote in 1594, 'how great an enemy of God's grace and of your own salvation you have among you! Rieger is ranting for a wager with the wicked enemy.' [2]

At Liegnitz the Superintendent Leonard Kreuzheim was banished from the country in the year 1593. The theologians of the Elector of Saxony had held a four days' disputation with him, after which the Duke had pronounced the following verdict on him: 'The delinquent was not only mixed up with Calvinism, but he

[1] Pandocheus, *Consensus, Vorrede* A[4]; *Apologie, Vorrede* A 3–4.
[2] Pandocheus, *Apologie*, N[2].

was also associated with the papists, for he had confessed to having written letters to popish scholars, and he did not call them papists but Catholics, just as he also called the Jesuits the gentlemen of the Order of Jesus, although the latter belonged to the order of the devil, and their community was the school of Satan.' [1]

The ducal Administrator Frederic William of Saxony, one of the most high-minded princes of the century in all that concerned the Fatherland, attached himself forthwith with full conviction to the 'Emperor and the imperial loyalists,' pronounced condign judgment on all 'foreign intrigues and conspiracies,' and thus placed himself deliberately in opposition to the policy of the Palatine Electorate. The proposed Protestant League in the Empire fell through for the present, owing especially to the deaths of two of its chief promoters. The Count Palatine John Casimir, who had taken the lead in the scheme, died on January 16, 1592, and in September of the same year death removed a most zealous supporter of the movement in the person of William, Landgrave of Hesse.

The last years of the Count Palatine had been extremely sad. With his Lutheran wife Elizabeth he had lived on terms of increasing disagreement, and had even kept her in confinement on account of alleged infidelity to him; at her death in 1590 there arose 'grave suspicions that she had been poisoned.' [2] John Casimir's confidential friend of long standing, La Huguerye, who makes this statement, connects the charge of poisoning with comprehensive political-

[1] Ehrhardt, *Presbyterologie oder evangelische Kirchen- und Predigergeschichte des Fürstenthums Liegnitz* (Liegnitz, 1789), pp. 92–110.

[2] '. . . non sans grand soupçon de poison.'

matrimonial schemes of her husband. The latter, he writes, fell at last into such profound melancholy that he died of it.[1]

There was great lamentation among the Calvinists over the death of John Casimir. 'The anointed of the Lord, who was our strong consolation, is gone,' said the preacher Johann Strack in a funeral sermon preached at Cassel. Nature was invoked to mourn him:

> Ye grass and foliage, vale and hill,
> No dew upon you shall distil,
> Unless with me ye mourn in tears
> The good strong bow, the sword, the shield,
> That Christian Casimir did wield,
> A valiant fighter all his years. . . .
> In one short year we've lost two Cs,
> Count Casimir and Christian; these
> Two deaths great woe portend.[2]

The Catholics breathed freely again. The Bishop of Strasburg, Johann von Manderscheid, after the deaths of Christian and of John Casimir, wrote on January 31 and on February 2, 1592, to Duke William of Bavaria: 'We are in hopes that the formidable and sinister undertaking with which we were threatened may now meet with obstacles, or at any rate be delayed. We cannot be sufficiently thankful to Almighty God that He has willed by His almighty power, and for the maintenance of His divine glory and religion, to ward off so much evil from the Catholics. If ever, during the last thirty years, there has been an opportunity for re-establishing the Religious Peace on a firm footing, and for asserting the plain text of the treaty, it is at the present moment;

[1] La Huguerye, iii. 328–329; ii. 330.

[2] Joh. Strackius, *Eine christliche Leichpredigt über den Tod Joh. Casimirs*, &c. (Heidelberg, 1592), s. 3 ff. 25–32.

we can now erect a barrier which will effectually prevent Calvinism from forcing its way back again to the Empire. The Emperor too, if he wished for a Diet, might make favourable preparations for holding one.'[1] But only a few months later, after the death of Bishop Johann, it again became evident at Strasburg how impotent the Emperor was, and how powerful, on the contrary, was that party in the Empire which did not trouble itself in the least about existing rights and the stipulations of the Religious Peace.

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 20. See in connection with this the passages contributed by Zöchbaur (i. 42 ff.) from the Roman Archives.

CHAPTER VIII

THE STRIFE IN THE STRASBURG CHAPTER AND THE CONSEQUENCES FOR ALSATIA

AFTER the unfortunate issue of the Calvinistic campaign against the archbishopric of Cologne, the contest was transferred to Strasburg with the result of plunging the territory of Alsatia into unutterable misery.[1]

The town council of Strasburg, in violation of the terms of the Augsburg Religious Peace, had forcibly suppressed Catholic worship in the town,[2] and it had afterwards attempted to achieve the election of a Protestant bishop by the chapter. Its endeavours, however, had been fruitless. In the year 1590 the Cologne canon, Count John of Manderscheid-Blankenheim, had been raised to the episcopal chair. This prelate was

[1] Al. Meister, *Der Strassburger Kapitelstreit*, 1583–1592: a contribution to the history of the counter-reformation (Strasburg, 1899). *Ibid.* 'Akten zum Schisma im Strassburger Dŏm-Kapitel, 1583–1592,' in the *Mittheilungen der Gesellschaft für Erhaltung der geschichtlichen Denkmäler im Elsass*, 2 Folge, 19 (1899), pp. 282–359. Meister lays great emphasis on the fact, not sufficiently recognised before, that the chronological coincidence of the Strasburg quarrel with the Cologne disturbances was not purely accidental, but that the two affairs were closely connected. For the Protestant party it was not only a question of the personalities of the canons in question, but of the principle of 'emancipation.' The Protestant nobles wanted to secure to themselves a share in the cathedral canonries as a convenient provision for their younger sons. Thus the Protestant canons of Strasburg met everywhere with ready support from the Protestant nobility and the Protestant princes, while the Emperor was too weak to secure the Catholics their rights and obedience to his mandates.

[2] See our remarks, vol. viii. 344, 345.

indeed a Catholic in name, but he was so wavering at first that he refused to take the oath on the *Tridentinum*. True to the name of Manderscheid he was, at the time of his election, more a friend than a foe to the Protestants. Even down to the year 1577 he had maintained an extremely equivocal attitude; he had managed to keep in with the Protestants even after his application, in 1573, for papal confirmation. It was his quarrel with the town of Strasburg, towards which he had to assert his episcopal rights, which first led him in 1577 to assume a decidedly Catholic position.[1]

In the Strasburg cathedral chapter most of the vacant canonries had been filled with Catholics, although the exclusion of Protestants had not become law. Excommunicated canons, however, according to an existing episcopal statute, had no seat or vote in the chapter, nor any right to the revenues, so long as they remained under the ban. Among the members of the chapter, non-resident in Strasburg, were the former Archbishop of Cologne, Gebhard Truchsess, and his partisans, the three Cologne canons, Herman Adolf von Solms, Johann von Winnenberg, and Georg von Wittgenstein, who had all been excommunicated by the papal nuncio in 1583, and had all been deprived of their dignities and benefices; in virtue of the above-mentioned statute these dignitaries had also been deprived of their posts at Strasburg and their emoluments.[1]

[1] See besides Lossen, 'Der Anfang des Strassburger Kapitelstreites,' in the *Abhandl. der Münchener Akad.* 1889, xvii. 754 ff., especially Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 4 ff.

[1] As is shown by Meister (*Kapitelstreit*, p. 23 ff.), the Bishop of Strasburg's first measures against Gebhard Truchsess and the excommunicated canons, especially the preparations for the election of a new dean of the chapter in place of Gebhard Truchsess, had been taken as early as the summer of

They were determined, however, not to give them up; and so, driven out of Cologne, they asserted their claims in Strasburg. The chapter had inquired of the Emperor what was to be done in case the excommunicated men should come to Strasburg, and Rudolf II. had given them orders not to let any division arise in the bishopric, and not to institute any proceedings contrary to the statutes of the diocese and the decrees of the Church. The town council was admonished by the Emperor to co-operate with the orthodox canons in safeguarding the welfare of the bishopric. But the members of the council sided with the excommunicated dignitaries in declaring the sentence of the ban to be null and void, and the statute based on this sentence obsolete; for the Pope, they said, did not possess the right to pronounce judgment on adherents of the Augsburg Confession. They paid no attention to the commands of

1583, and not at the beginning of 1584, as Ritter, Lossen, and others make out. On December 3, 1583, the chapter drew up the formal decree of exclusion against these men; printed by Meister, *Akten zum Schisma*, &c., p. 286 ff. On July 14, 1584, Duke Frederic of Sachsen-Lauenburg, *Chor*-bishop of Cologne and member of the Strasburg chapter, was elected dean of the chapter by a majority of the canons. Lossen (*l. c.* 761) says the three excommunicated canons 'cannot be blamed for claiming rightful possession of their Strasburg benefices on the ground of usage.' In opposition to this let me remark: Assuming, but not granted, that no express chapter-statute against the excommunicated persons was extant; nevertheless, as Lossen also acknowledges, the legality of the exclusion of these men could follow from other measures taken by the chapter. Besides which—and this is the principal matter—the Protestant canons as heretics were *ipso facto de jure communi* incapacitated from holding church benefices. It was with perfect justice, therefore, that in an imperial despatch (Lossen, p. 780), they were described as *ipso jure inhabiles*. The same conclusion followed from the ecclesiastical reservation. Accordingly, the Catholic canons, apart from any special statute, had the right and were in duty bound to exclude the Protestant canons. That the latter were left for a time in tranquil possession of their benefices proves nothing against the existing law. It was only a case of toleration overriding law.

the Emperor, for they declared that matters of religion could only be settled by the collective Estates of the Empire. Backed up by the council, the three excommunicated canons took forcible possession of the chapter-house, the so-called *Bruderhof*, and dealt as they liked with the provisions of the institution.[1] On February 1, 1585, they applied to Queen Elizabeth of England for help.[2] They strengthened their position by the enrolment of fresh Protestant members, and, regardless of how the Emperor might threaten, in 1588 they wrested the *Gürtlerhof* also from the Catholics.[3] In the following year they annulled the statute compelling a canon to renounce his post if he married, they declared the Catholic canons to have forfeited all their revenues, and they set to work to carry this resolution through by armed force.[4] In August 1589 Gebhard Truchsess also, having exhausted all his other sources of help, came to Strasburg to take up his residence there. After he had settled there, 'in spite of his original declaration that he would not meddle with the affairs of the chapter, the politics of the members of the *Bruderhof* were entirely managed by him and by Ernest of Mansfeld.'[5]

[1] Fuller details in Müller, *Restauration*, p. 8 ff.; *Bericht des Domkapitels vom 23 Dezember 1584*, in Theiner, iii. 518–519. The seizure of the *Bruderhof* by the excommunicated canons took place on August 28, 1584 (Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 77). Hermann Adolf von Solms, who had come to Strasburg later than the other two, was the actual originator of the aggressive proceedings, both the others having remained rather on the defensive until his arrival (Meister, p. 74 ff.). Concerning the failure of attempts at mediation between the two parties, see Meister, p. 84 ff. For the economical side of the contest see the incisive remarks of Meister, p. 207 ff.

[2] v. Bezold, ii. 241.

[3] Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 280 ff. Concerning further measures of violence from the Protestant chapter, see Meister, p. 367 ff.

[4] Müller, *Restauration*, p. 32 ff.

[5] Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 327 ff.

The Lutheran preachers of the town were on bad terms with the Calvinistic canons, but they also 'used godly zeal in extirpating all remaining traces of papistical life.' In the three convents of St. Margaret, St. Magdalen, and St. Nicholas in Undis, the Catholic Church service was still performed with closed doors. The town attorneys had themselves declared that the council had no right to put down the convents in defiance of the Religious Peace.[1] The preachers, on the other hand, headed by Johann Pappus, stood to their guns and reiterated, on March 3, 1591, in an address to the council, that 'it was the unconditional duty of the council to root out the Popish Church service. With the Religious Peace they were not going to concern themselves. St. Augustine had said that kings then only served God when they punished rigorously all that was contrary to the divine laws. It was in this way that "the holy kings" of the old covenant had acted: Hezekiah, who had destroyed the temples of idols; Darius, who had given Daniel authority to abolish the worship of Baal; Nebuchadnezzar, who had sternly forbidden his subjects to blasphème the God of Israel. The council must follow the pattern of these "holy kings." If they did not put their hands to the work quickly, it would be too late, for Popery was steadily gaining ground in Strasburg, and was bent on the ruin of the town and the Church.'[2]

All former attempts at converting the above-named convents 'to the pure gospel' had failed; with the nuns of St. Magdalen not even starvation had availed. All

[1] De Bussière, *Hist. des religieuses Dominicaines*, pp. 35–108.

[2] De Bussière, *Développement*, ii. 356–363. This document calls for attention on account of its distortion of historical facts and of the intolerance and the spirit of persecution which characterise it.

the same, at the instigation of the preachers, the council resolved to make another attack on the Antichrist—with a view also to confiscating the convent property for the benefit of the town. Once more the nuns were called upon to seek the happiness of life in the 'heaven of marriage.' Nevertheless, their courage and steadfastness put all flattery, threats, and persecution to shame. 'We commiserate you heartily,' the town deputies assured the Dominicanesses of St. Nicholas, 'for you lead a hard and irksome existence; no rest is allowed you day or night; you are forced to go into the choir at night, just as though you were a lot of dogs; so many fasts and night-watches are imposed on you that your legs will soon no longer be able to carry you, and yet with all this you do not attain to true salvation, because you are lacking in the true faith. Luther discovered the true Light, that Christ has made satisfaction for all sin, and that all our works are useless.' The prioress of the convent, Susannah Brünn, whose virtue was suspected, had to submit to treatment over which we must draw a veil.[1] Although she was pronounced innocent, she was put in prison and obliged to serve for four years as maid-servant to the gaoler. When her health gave way and she became seriously ill, the council tried to coerce her into making a formal surrender of the convent of St. Nicholas to the town. She declared, however, that she would rather rot in the tower than participate in an act of robbery, for the convent was not her property but that of the order.[2]

The Catholics obtained no help; neither the nuns,

[1] De Bussière, *Hist. des religieuses Dominicaines*, pp. 138-140.

[2] De Bussière, pp. 141-157, where fuller details are given concerning the fate of the nuns.

nor the Bishop, nor the canons. It was utterly in vain that Duke William of Bavaria, in 1591, begged the Emperor to exercise his authority against the excommunicated canons, urging on him that if he did not do so, the imperial prestige, the constitution of the realm, and the Catholic religion would all be seriously injured, and the way opened up for Protestantism in all the dioceses: for with the loss of the Strasburg bishopric they would also lose an important pass—the key indeed to France—and the neighbouring Catholic districts, above all the outlying possessions of Austria, would be exposed to great danger.[1] Not till 1592, when the sudden death, on May 2, of Bishop Johann of Manderscheid gave reason to fear that a Protestant candidate might be elected, did the Emperor proceed in earnest to sequestrate the bishopric and pronounce judgment between the two contending parties. He instructed the Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol to take possession of the property of the bishopric, and prepared the canons and the council for the arrival of imperial delegates.[2] Despite the imperial action,

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 52. Concerning the reasons of the Emperor's holding back the intercession of Protestant imperial princes with Rudolf in favour of the Strasburg Protestant canons, see Ehses-Meister, *Nuntiaturberichte*, i. 1, lxxxiii. and 320 ff. From the ecclesiastical Electors also the Catholic canons got no support, because, although the Electors of Cologne and Treves were very willing to espouse their cause, the Elector of Mayence, on the other hand, managed to thwart every attempt at decisive and united action (Meister, 'Die Haltung der drei geistlichen Kurfürsten in der Strassburger Stiftsfehde,' 1583–1592, in the *Annalen des Vereins für Geschichte des Niederrheins*, Heft 61 (1895), pp. 95–128; *Der Strassburger Kapitelstreit*, p. 186 ff.). Duke William of Bavaria was 'the only prince on whom Bishop Johann could rely' (Meister, p. 319 ff.).

[2] Hirn, ii. 206. Archduke Ferdinand had already, in 1590, been charged with the work of sequestration, but without further results (Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 360 ff.; *Akten zum Schisma im Strassburger Domkapitel*, p. 339 ff.). Concerning the 'threatening presages of war,'

however, the Protestant canons, on May 30, elected as bishop the fifteen-year-old Margrave, John George of Brandenburg, grandson of the Elector John George, Administrator of the bishopric. But this election was at variance with a resolution which had been carried by the chapter under the deceased bishop, before its split, and had also been agreed to by the Protestant members. The resolution was to the effect that 'every bishop must promise in his election capitulation to hold fast to the Catholic Church and not to make any alterations in the creed which was publicly recognised in the bishopric.' According to this measure a Protestant could not be Bishop of Strasburg. None the less, however, the new members of the chapter—mostly Calvinists—and the council, heedless of all prescriptions and statutes, at once proceeded to take up arms. The town made over to the Administrator 2,000 infantry and 60 cavalry; Zürich and Bern sent auxiliary troops,[1] and thus John George made an attempt to possess himself by force of the bishopric and its property.

The Catholic canons now felt that they must not wait any longer for the Emperor to interfere; in order to preserve the bishopric in the established faith they proceeded to a counter-election and nominated as bishop of the diocese, the Bishop of Metz, Cardinal

even in the last years of Bishop Johann von Manderscheid, who at last gave up all heart, see Meister, *Kapitelstreit*, p. 366 ff.

[1] In connection with the quarrel of the chapter, Strasburg had already in 1584 solicited admission to the Swiss League; but after protracted negotiations had been rejected by the opposition of the Catholic cantons. On the other hand, in 1588, the alliance of Strasburg with Zürich and Bern had been accomplished. See Meister, *Ein Gesuch der Stadt Strasburg um Aufnahme in der eidgenossischen Bund 1584–1586*; *das Bündniss Strasburgs mit Zürich und Bern* (in the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins*, Neue Folge, 9 (1894), pp. 638–664; ibid. *Kapitelstreit*, p. 268 ff.).

Charles of Lorraine, son of the Duke of Lorraine. The latter advanced into the bishopric with a strong body of troops and met everywhere with a hearty welcome: the towns gladly opened their gates to him, the people swore fidelity to him. But he was compelled to take the field in defence against the Administrator. When, however, in June 1592, an imperial deputation presented itself and required him to lay down his arms, the Cardinal answered that he would lead his troops away forthwith, if his adversary also would suspend all hostilities. But neither the Administrator nor the town council were disposed to peace. They applied for help to the Protestant princes of the Empire, to the King of Denmark, and to the French King, and urged repeatedly on the latter how important Strasburg was to France.

On both sides the war was carried on remorselessly. Charles of Lorraine, however, although victorious everywhere with his better disciplined troops, was at last anxious to avoid further bloodshed, and towards the end of August he listened to proposals for mediation from a deputation sent by neighbouring princes and towns. The terms finally agreed upon were so easy and honourable that it seemed impossible that they could be rejected by John George and the council. Both parties were to lay down their arms and to take the matter into court; both were to disband all their troops and remove them from the country on the same day, and to grant each other reciprocally free passes to their own lands and cities. All that the Cardinal had conquered was to fall to the town of Strasburg, which was to receive all taxes and dues, and to administer the episcopal revenues until the decision of the court had been given. The armistice

was to last until such decision had been pronounced, and no one party was to be allowed to attack the other.

But things took an unexpected turn. The council, hoping for help from Christian of Anhalt, rejected these peace proposals on August 27, saying that it was 'incompatible with his honour and his conscience' to agree to them. The war lasted on, and the opponents did not come to terms till the end of February 1593, when a contract was arranged by which the bishopric was divided between the Cardinal and the Protestant Administrator, Strasburg retained all the property, and fixed incomes were assigned to the beneficiaries of both creeds. For eight months long unutterable misery had prevailed throughout Alsace, the trade of Strasburg was completely ruined, and the financial resources of the town so greatly reduced that the town was never again able to recover its former importance. The pay of the troops alone had swallowed up 800,000 florins. The Calvinistic canons, who by word and writing had steadily kept up the war of creeds, incurred the hatred of the Lutherans as well as of the Catholics.[1]

[1] Müller, *Restauration*, pp. 54–95. See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 54 ff. See also *Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins*, 1887, ii. 481 ff. John George did not renounce his 'rights' to the bishopric till 1604, when he accepted a handsome compensation in money; the Protestant canons contracted an agreement with the Cardinal, and the town was bound over to recognise the latter as the sole rightful head of the bishopric. Gebhard Truchsess, who had come to Strasburg with the Countess Agnes in 1589, died universally despised in 1601. His 'bosom friend,' the Protestant Archbishop Henry of Bremen, had died in 1585. Before his death he had seriously wounded the concubine whom he had married (see above, p. 51). He was thrown from his horse and (so a report says) the injuries received had brought on such a state of melancholia 'ut etiam id, quod in terris habuit charissimum, propriis manibus fere suffocasset. Item uterque frater, Franciscus, Magnus, filtrum (sic) et uxor vel quasi acceperunt lethalia vulnera a principe,' 'who frequently said to her, in angry tones: "Away from me, you living devil!" He would tear the clothes off her body. In short, his behaviour was altogether most pitiful' (v. Bezold, ii. 268, note 2).

CHAPTER IX

THE TURKS ALLIED WITH THE CHRISTIAN POWERS AGAINST THE HOUSE OF HABSBURG—RELIGIOUS TRANSACTIONS AT RATISBON IN 1594

THE utter powerlessness of the Emperor in all internal affairs of the Empire, which had again shown itself so conspicuously in the Cologne war and the dispute concerning the Strasburg bishopric, was in great measure occasioned by the incessant assaults of the Turks on the imperial hereditary lands.

Popes Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V. had vainly endeavoured to organise 'a new general league against the hereditary foe of the Christian name.' 'The schism between the Christian states,' wrote (in 1585) Gianfrancesco Morosini, the Venetian ambassador accredited to Constantinople, 'is undoubtedly the chief cause of the success of the Turks; they would not be able to hold out against a united resistance on the part of the Christians. The Turks entertain deadly hatred against the Pope, because they fear that he will bring about a league of all the Christian powers.' [1] Sixtus V. had

[1] '. . . più d'ogni altro è odiato il pontefice, sebbene delle sue proprie forze non se fanno alcuna stima, ma credendo ch'egli possa esser istrumento per unire gli altri principi della cristianità, gli portano odio mortale.' (Albèri, Ser. iii. 299–300, 307). Concerning the Pope as mediator between the Christian powers, see also the report of Matteo Zane of 1594, p. 440. Concerning the endeavours of Gregory XIII. to organise a crusade, see v. Bezold, *Rudolf II. und die heilige Liga*, p. 362 ff., and Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, vii. ff.

hoped to be able to unite all the forces of the north-east and the south-west for the annihilation of the hereditary foe: he had meditated conquering Egypt, connecting the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, re-establishing the ancient world commerce, and rescuing the holy sepulchre from the hands of the infidels.[1]

But 'the mightiest among the Christians were on the side of the Turks:' the Venetians, Elizabeth of England, Henry IV. of France. Elizabeth considered it a special duty to convince the Sultan that the English, because they were decided enemies of popish idolatry, were much nearer to the Mohammedan faith than to that of the Emperor and the Catholics. 'The only thing lacking to make the English true Mohammedans,' a pasha said once to the imperial messenger Betz, 'was public confession of their faith.'[2] Henry IV. proffered sincerest friendship to the Sultan and received from Amurath the assurance that he should support with all his might 'the man who hated the false worship of idols.'[3] The Sultan was rejoiced—so the chief pasha said in 1590—to see a king ascend the French throne who was an enemy of Spain and of the Pope.[4]

France was the only power, Henry wrote to the Sultan on April 4, 1592, that had hitherto hindered the execution of those plans which Philip II., and Charles V. before him, were constantly hatching for the overthrow of the power 'with which your Highness is invested by the grace of God.' He had incurred the hatred and enmity of the Spanish King, who was now wanting to

[1] Ranke, *Päpste*, ii. 196-197.
[2] v. Hammer, *Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches*, iv. 208; Hurtes, iii. 104.
[3] Berger de Xivrey, ii. 364, note. Without date.
[4] Hübner, ii. 339-340.

seize the French crown, for no other reason, he said, than that he would not ally himself with the latter against Turkey.[1] At the instigation of Queen Elizabeth 200 galleys were built on the Turkish wharfs for a naval war against Spain.[2] The English and French ambassadors, so the Venetian Matteo Zane reported, 'are continually negotiating with the grand vizier concerning the concentration of the united Turkish forces against Spain; they keep him punctually informed of all the latest news they receive from Christendom; so also do the Jews, who have agents and reporters everywhere.'[3]

The Emperor was 'tributary to the Turks.' In order merely to keep up the armistice he was obliged, as his father had been before him, to pay the Sultan a yearly sum of 130,000 florins, besides 'a present of silverwork and clockwork.'[4] In spite of the armistice yearly incursions of the Turks took place in the imperial hereditary lands: 'the imperial coffers and the resources of the subjects were well-nigh exhausted.' Only from Rome and from Madrid did Rudolf receive regular supplies of money; the Turkish aids contributed by Philip II. amounted yearly to 100,000 ducats; in some years indeed they rose to three times as much.[5]

[1] Berger de Xivrey, iii. 608. [2] Hübner, ii. 341.

[3] Albèri, Ser. 3, iii. 436.

[4] See the despatches of the imperial councillor and financier, Johann Vest, to Frankfort, and a despatch of Rudolf II. to Vest, dated October 23, 1588, in the *Frankfurter Kaiserschreiben*, 15 fol. p. 162–167. The Turks, wrote the Venetian Lorenzo Bernardo in 1592, boast that the Emperor of the Christians is their tributary to the yearly amount of 45,000 thalers. 'Et attretanti in argenti appresentanti a sua maestà, che quasi in trionfo fanno entrare nella città.' They are not much concerned about him, because he has very meagre forces and because his empire is divided by religion (Albèri, Ser. 3, iii. 332–383).

[5] Hurter, iii. 105, 107–108.

The imperial Estates had, it is true, promised a very considerable subsidy in 1582 for the defence of the Hungarian and Slav frontiers, but the payments had been so deficient that ten years later there were still arrears of 800,000 florins. He did not know 'how to get the money in,' the imperial treasurer, Zacharias Geizkofler, wrote to Duke Ernest on June 13, 1592; 'the Estates care neither for fiscal proceedings nor for extra-judicial warnings.' [1]

At the instigation of the Albanian Sinan, who had been appointed Grand Vizier, and who was a bitter enemy of the Christians, Sultan Murad III. issued, on August 13, 1593, a declaration of war against the Emperor. While Sinan was preparing a powerful army for the onslaught, the Pashas were carrying on the war in Hungary, and the Turks looked forward to free entrance into Germany and Italy, or at any rate to the conquest of Bohemia.[2] In Austria it was feared that the hereditary enemy would soon be seen before Vienna or Graz. The Bavarian agent in Vienna applied at once to Duke William for leave to send his family back to Bavaria in case of the town being attacked.[3] The frontier fortresses were in bad condition, there was a dearth of soldiers, of materials of war, of provisions, and above all of money. Pope Clement VIII., who had already in 1592 given the Emperor money aids against the Turks, promised, as soon as the war should break out, to contribute 30,000 florins per month, and he set to work, though with as little success as his predecessor, to organise a general anti-Turkish league.[4]

[1] Hurter, iii. 92. [2] Ranke, *Fürsten und Völker Südeuropas*, i. 83.
[3] Stieve, *Ursprung, Quellenbericht*, p. 27.
[4] Zöchbaur, ii. 10, notes 1 and 2, and 16, note 1; Hurter, iii. 107–108; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 167, note 4; Ranke, *Päpste*, ii. 302.

On March 19, 1594, he instructed his legate Madruzzi to impress most urgently on the Catholic Estates that at the Diet at Ratisbon the question of Turkish subsidies would be discussed, and that it was their duty to support the Emperor enthusiastically; every nerve must be strained to withstand and fight the hereditary foe, if the whole of Germany was not to fall a prey to Turkish bondage.[1]

The Emperor had long put off summoning a Diet, for he feared that he would get little help from one, and that it would only afford fresh opportunity for evil dealings.[2] It was not till the extremity of the danger was under his very eyes that he negotiated with the Electors concerning a Diet at Ratisbon. The day of assembling was first fixed for April 17, and then postponed to May 1, 1594. Saxony and Brandenburg evinced 'hearty and joyous zeal.' At Dresden the Administrator, Frederic William, declared with the same firmness as the Pope, that the utmost vigour must be put forth against the Turks; if the Calvinistic Elector Frederic IV. of the Palatinate, who had succeeded to the government on the death of John Casimir, 'chose to be singular,' as his marriage with the daughter of William of Orange 'might give him cause to be,' his holding back alone 'would not matter much.'[3] John George was well disposed to give generous help, only he could not appear in person at Ratisbon,

In the course of a few years Clement spent one and a half million scudi on the war. See now also Mathaus-Voltolini in *Römische Quartalschr.* 1901, p. 303 ff.

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 198, note 2.

[2] The Catholic Estates also had at first considered a Diet dangerous (Zöchbaur, ii. 11, 15, 18).

[3] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 200, note.

he told one of the imperial ambassadors, because the Tartars might possibly press into the Mark through Poland. He, too, was most decided in condemnation of the Palatine policy.[1]

The Palatine policy had remained the same under Frederic IV. as it had been under the earlier Palatine Electors; now as then its aim was to make all foreign and internal difficulties and dangers of the Empire conduce to the accomplishment of their own revolutionary plans. At a conclave summoned by Frederic at Heilbronn on March 26, 1594, a resolution had been passed by several Estates to the effect that they would contribute no Turkish subsidies until the Protestant grievances had been redressed, and, first and foremost, until the ecclesiastical reservation had been abolished. Not indeed to fight the Turks, but to support Henry IV. of France they would make rivers of money flow: he should have 400,000 in case of need, 600,000 florins in return for a plighted promise to compel the Cardinal of Lorraine to renounce the bishopric of Strasburg in favour of the Margrave John George.[2] Henry's trusty friend, Duplessis-Mornay, had long been fully aware of the benefits which had accrued from former alliances of French kings with German princes: it is by means of these alliances, he wrote, 'that they have maintained their liberty, and we have retained the principal keys of the frontier.' 'We will set Germany on fire, and we will so manage matters that we shall reap the fruits of its death when God ordains it . . .'[3]

[1] Stieve, i. 199.

[2] 'Heilbronner Recess vom 16 (26) März 1594,' in the *Archivium Unito-Protestantium*, App. 2–9. See v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 432–433.

[3] '. . . . eulx, leur liberté, nous les principales clefs de la frontiere.' 'Nous laissons tousjours la guerre contre l'Espaignol ouverte, comme ung

The French ambassador, Bongars, under whose auspices the Heilbronn resolutions were passed, had no great admiration for the Protestant princes. 'I call them evangelical,' he wrote to a friend, 'although, on closer acquaintance, I see nothing evangelical about them except the name.' [1]

A few years before, many among the Catholics, Metternich for one, had still been confident and hopeful.[2] Now, however, they began to tremble for the Empire. 'From numbers of loyal-hearted folk,' wrote Metternich to Duke William of Bavaria on April 24, 1594, 'there come warnings to the Catholics to be well on their guard at the Diet, saying that the Protestants resolved at Heilbronn to demand much that will be detrimental to the Catholics.' 'Now the ecclesiastics, unfortunately, are so constituted that it is to be feared they will show more fear than zeal. If, then, your Excellency does not do the very best in this extremity, things will fare badly. The Calvinists in the Palatinate and elsewhere never pause in their efforts, and they will not rest till they have deluged Germany with blood.' [3] The Lutheran theologian, George Mylius, accused the Calvinistic Estates of being actually in secret league with the Turks: if ever, he said, addressing the people in the year 1595, at imperial, circle, or provincial Diets, any measures are proposed for resistance to the

cautere, pour vuider nos mauvaises humeurs. Nous fomenterons les revoltes d'Aragon, et aultres nos amis, ou plustot ses envieulx en Italie, qui souspirent vers nous. Nous reschaufferons l'Italie (l'Allemaigne), nous nous rendrons habiles à recueillir le fruict de sa mort, quand Dieu l'ordonnera. . . .' (Duplessis-Mornay, iv. 204, and v. 214; see v. 229–291).

[1] Bongars, ii. 413. To Camerarius in October 1595.

[2] See above, p. 145, 146.

[3] Stieve, i. 180, note 3.

hereditary enemy, the Calvinists invariably oppose them. 'They are not ashamed to declare, in opposition to the whole Roman Empire, that there is neither reason nor right in fighting against the Turks.' [1]

On June 2, 1594, the Diet was opened.

The Count Palatine, at a special conference, laid before the Protestant Estates a document with the declaration that the grievances enumerated in it must all be removed at the present Diet, or else they would 'contribute nothing' for the Emperor; on the contrary, they should be compelled 'to keep back their contributions and to use them for their own defence.' Among other stipulations in this document was the admission of Protestants to all ecclesiastical benefices, and in conjunction with this the abolition of 'the unchristian oaths, the harsh statutes, and the ordination vows' to which evangelical princes, counts, and lords could not conscientiously submit. The papal ban and excommunication, whereby the Pope sought to exclude the evangelicals from benefices, must be abolished, for the Pope was not the head of the Church; he was nothing more than 'the Babylonish whore, the child of corruption, who dared to set himself up above all that appertained to God or to God's service, even above God Himself.' Freedom of religious worship must be accorded to all evangelicals resident under popish Estates, and the Imperial Chamber must be reformed according to evangelical requirements: two Imperial Chambers must be established—one on the Rhine, the other in Saxony or in Brunswick.[2]

[1] *Predigten von den Türken*, p. 38[b].

[2] The Frankfort delegate obtained a copy of the document through Doctor Andreas Christian, the syndic of the Courts of Wetterau (*Reichstagsakten*, p. 2, fol. 1–7).

But the extreme Lutheran princes, the Administrator of Saxony, and the Dukes of Neuburg, Würtemberg, Mecklenburg, and Holstein, would not join with the Calvinists in discussing matters of religion, neither would they consent to reviving the question of the ecclesiastical reservation, or to making the grant of Turkish subsidies dependent on the redress of 'grievances.' The Administrator insisted that the Empire must support Hungary and the Emperor against the Turks at any price, and that internal affairs must not hinder them from defending themselves against foreign aggressors.[1] The majority, however, of the Protestant Estates ranged themselves on the side of the Count Palatine; the list of grievances, with certain passages altered and with sundry additions, was handed in to the Emperor on June 26.[2]

Rudolf passed it on to the Catholic Estates for consideration, and they in turn drew up another list of grievances, wherein there was no lack of bitter attacks against the Calvinists. 'All the disturbances in the Empire and all the division of spirits,' they said, 'arose from the fact that side by side with the two religious parties included in the Religious Peace, other new sects, the Calvinists especially, had gone on creeping in. If, according to the terms of the treaty, only the orthodox Catholic faith and the Augsburg Confession had been tolerated, they would without doubt have been able to live together more harmoniously; for a very considerable proportion of the adherents of the Augsburg Confession had always behaved with the utmost discretion and friendliness towards the Catholic Estates and were

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 63 ff.

[2] Lehmann, pp. 218–224 (very faulty). See Häberlin, xviii. 474–499.

on excellent terms with them. The Augsburg Confessionists had said, as long ago as the year 1557, and again in their declaration of 1576, that the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the Empire must be preserved intact, and not secularised, and that the Catholics should be left undisturbed in their freedom of election, their spiritual administration, their statutes, dignities, liberties, and possessions. Through the intrusion, however, of the Calvinists and of other sects, although the genuine Augsburg Confession is not wholly abolished and obliterated, yet the seeds of unrest are sown in many parts of the Empire, so that the Religious Peace is no longer interpreted according to the wording of the text, nor in any rational manner, and all that is thought of is the suppression of the Catholic religion. By persecution and by artful seduction of the subjects, lay and clerical, by confiscation or reduction of their incomes, the Catholic Estates and the Catholic religion, as is universally known, are deprived of their rights and privileges, and, against the law of all nations, even of the heathen, no mercy is shown to churches, convents, or ecclesiastical persons.'

The discontent and acrimony resulting from all this were aggravated by the unpardonable abuse uttered from pulpits against religious opponents. 'The Catholics are not allowed to defend themselves either by word or by writing, or to refute accusations in the customary legal manner, and they are obliged to suffer in silence while the preachers, both by word and writing, and even here at the Diet, call the Pope an Antichrist and the devil's dregs, and denounce all Catholics as idolaters, relegate them to hell-fire, and even extend their attacks to the secular Catholic princes. Indi-

vidual Catholics can put up with a good deal, but it is insufferable to them that the adversaries, who would not for a moment tolerate any attack on their own princes and chiefs, should thus insult and revile the Pope whom the Emperor and the Catholic Estates revere as their supreme head.' The petitioners earnestly implored the Emperor 'to insist firmly that the two religions which had been sanctioned in the Empire by the Religious Peace should be equally recognised, and that no other erroneous opinions should be allowed to creep in among them, causing fresh discord and separation, destroying all that remained of mutual trust, and accomplishing the certain ruin of the Holy Empire.' [1]

The Emperor was promised a generous Turkish subsidy of eighty 'Roman months;' the money was to be paid up by the year 1600. But those of the Protestant Estates who had sent up the petition of grievances on July 26 handed in on August 13 a protest against the Recess, saying that 'they reserved their grievances,' as the Emperor had left the grievances unredressed.[2]

[1] Wolf, *Maximilian*, i. 155-169; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 452-567. In the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 87 fol. 226-253.

[2] Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 83 fol. 206-215. For the transactions at the Diet (1594) concerning Rudolf's successor, see Zöchbaur, ii. 23 ff. Madruz Speciano and de S. Clemente were the movers; the obstruction came from the Emperor himself, not from the party of agitation. Finally Rudolf postponed the question to a meeting of Electors, which he promised to convene, saying that the Electors were not all assembled at the present Diet, and that those in attendance had not been summoned together for this purpose (*l.c.* 30). The Emperor, however, did not summon an Electoral Diet. He was again occupied with matrimonial negotiations (*ibid.* 31, 32). Much was hoped for from the interference of the Elector Ernest, but his efforts also were without result (*ibid.* 34, 35). The Electors finally came to the conclusion that the first step towards settling the order of succession ought to be taken by the Emperor (*ibid.* 39).

CHAPTER X

PROGRESS OF THE TURKS SINCE 1594—NEGOTIATIONS FOR A PROTESTANT LEAGUE—CONVOCATION OF A FRESH DIET IN 1597

WHILE 'much talk and little doing' went on in the Empire about a Turkish subsidy, Pasha Sinan had set out at the head of an army of 150,000 men, had taken Totis, and on September 29, 1594, had made himself master of Raab, a most important stronghold for Hungary and Germany.[1] On receiving the news of this loss, Duke William of Bavaria called a consultation over the defence of his country and ordered a general muster of troops.[2] 'The Turks will soon be at our throats also,' said the Administrator of Saxony on October 27 to an ambassador of the Elector of Mayence, 'and nevertheless one sees nothing but lukewarmness among many of the Estates, and a disposition to foreign French intrigues, which derive their chief support from the Calvinists of Heidelberg.'[3] In November Duplessis-Mornay expressed fears that the Turks might easily advance as far as the Rhine; but, owing to the 'stiffneckedness' of Spain, 'we were almost compelled

[1] Huber, iv. 380; Zöchbaur, ii. 36.

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 933 zu s. 242. 'I am frightened almost to death of the Turks,' wrote the Archduchess Maria to Duke William on September 26, 1594 (Stieve, *Wittels. Briefe*, ii. 163).

[3] Report of Dr. Friedrich Mangolt, the ambassador of the Elector of Mayence, November 2, 1594, in a *Convolute: Religions- und Reichssachen von 1593–1605.*

to laugh at the tears of Christendom and to applaud at our own downfall.' [1] The power of Spain, however, was at that time in the profoundest state of exhaustion; in the Netherlands it was on the eve of dissolution.[2] In Germany, Spain had lost nearly all her prestige.[3] In France, Henry IV., after having made 'the dangerous plunge' [4] of becoming Catholic without conviction, had been in possession of Paris since March 22, 1594.

'France and Spain at war together, in spite of all the Pope's endeavours at mediation; the Christian army which is fighting the Turks—according to all the news which pours in from Hungary—in a most melancholy condition, anything rather than Christian in valour and in morality; and, added to this, constant fresh preparations on the part of the hereditary enemy. And so we live here'—so runs a letter from Rome dated March 25, 1595—'in constant dread of coming events.' One of the generals has lately written from Hungary as follows: 'There is much more obedience and endurance among the Turks than in the drunken Christian army.' [5]

In a description of the camp life in Hungary, written in the same year by the Lutheran theologian, George Mylius, there occurs the following passage: 'The Turks

[1] Duplessis-Mornay, vi. 102. [2] Stieve, i. 193, 450–452.

[3] The Spanish ambassador to the Diet of Ratisbon, Don Guillen de S. Clemente, wrote to Madrid on August 30, 1594: 'S. M^te. doibt croire certainement, que depuis long temps en ça la reputation de sa grandeur et de ses forces n'a esté en plus mauvais termes, qu'elle est maintenant en Allemagne' (Stieve, i. 470).

[4] Ranke, *Französiche Geschichte*, i. 569. To his Calvinistic friends Henry said, at the time of his conversion, that 'he had been persuaded by no other theologian than the necessity of the State.' To the Catholic prelates, on the other hand, he said 'the Holy Ghost had touched his heart' (see v. Polenz, iv. 705).

[5] Letter of the papal privy chamberlain, Karl Friedemann, to the Jesuit Wilhelm Meyer at Ingoldstadt.

do not drag after them into the field so many and so many barrels of Rhine wine and Malvoisie; do not swill themselves day and night; do not give themselves up to gambling, dancing, and profligacy in the camp, as though they were at wedding festivities; do not have women brought in and out of their tents; do not take their jesters with them to amuse them; do not need ring-sticking and such like diversions; but they are temperate and orderly, are on the look-out by day and by night, and discipline themselves as if, like the monks, they were chastising their bodies.' 'Drunkenness, that terrible vice of the Germans, is our worst enemy also with regard to the Turks, and brings us into dire disgrace. The Turks indeed are sublime in their ridicule of this failing of ours.' Some one writes from Constantinople that when last autumn Sinan Pasha himself arrived there after the close of the campaign in Hungary, he caused some of the German prisoners to be loaded with chains, made each of them hold a glass of wine in the right hand and a pack of cards in the other, and then had them taken round Constantinople and exhibited as a public spectacle with the notice affixed: 'Hereby it is seen in what the art of German warfare consists: namely, dealing out cards and tossing the wine-glass; such fools as these must be conquered with clubs and shamed with mockery and ridicule.' [1]

The campaign of 1595 brought the fortress of Gran

[1] Mylius, *Predigten vom Türken*, 72[b], 90[b]. Hans Christian von Scharp, a veteran in the Turkish war, said in the memorandum of the campaign of 1596 which he drew up for the Emperor: 'The landsknechts encumber themselves to such an extent with disreputable females, that in some of the regiments in this campaign there were quite as many, if not more, women to be seen as men. These sluts ruin the soldiers and swallow up the provisions' (Falkmann, *Graf Simon VI. Zur Lippe und seine Zeit. Zweite Periode* (Detmold, 1887), p. 211, note 2).

into the possession of the imperial army. But in the following year the Sultan Mehemet III., as 'Ruler of the whole world from the rising to the setting sun,' joined the 'holy war' in his own person, and seized Erlau on October 13.[1] Vienna was placed in a state of defence, for the road there was opened out to the Turks from Raab; from Erlau they could press on to Moravia, to Silesia, into the Mark of Brandenburg, and down the Oder as far as to the German Ocean. 'If Raab falls,' the Archduchess Maria had written shortly before the surrender of the town, 'Vienna's turn will come next, and then God help us.'[2]

A few weeks after Erlau, 'the principal key of Christendom,' had been taken by the Turks, the States General joined themselves to the League which had been concluded between Elizabeth of England and Henry IV. against Spain in May 1596. It was hoped that Scotland and Denmark, Venice and the leading Protestant princes of the Empire would also be drawn into this League.[3] At the end of October the French diplomat Bongars solicited the Palatine Elector to join.[4] At the end of December an ambassador of Henry IV. addressed an appeal to him to the same effect, and also to the Margrave George Frederic of Ansbach.[5] Even before the French solicitation, negotiations concerning the formation of a Protestant League had been entered into at Amberg, on October 10, between the Elector, the Margrave, and the Landgrave Maurice of Hesse-Cassel, who had succeeded his father William in the

[1] Huber, iv. 393, 396 ff. A poem on the siege of Gran in the year 1595 was published by Heyck in the *Mittheil. des österreich. Institutes*, 1887, p. 107 ff.

[2] Hurter, iii. 367.

[3] Wenzelburger, ii. 687-688.

[4] Bongars, *Lettres*, ii. 62-66.

[5] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 89.

autumn of 1592. The immediate object of this alliance was to be the vindication of the Protestant claims on the duchy of Jülich-Cleves. In the affairs of Jülich, the Chancellor of the Administrator of Magdeburg wrote to his lord: 'Maurice, according to his own statements, is reckoning on the assistance of great potentates, not in troops but in money.' This 'assistance' was to represent, in the case of the princes, the price of admission to the Anglo-Franco-Netherlandish League, and it was for this reason that Maurice recommended it.

The negotiations at Amberg, however, were defeated —just as those at Torgau had been in 1592—by the opposition of other Protestant Estates. The Administrator of Saxony was not to be won by any means whatever; the Elector John George of Brandenburg in like manner refused all participation in the scheme, and was in no way inclined to enter into an alliance with foreign powers, which would be in open contradiction to the constitution of the Empire. Even the councillors of the Landgrave Maurice declared such a league to be illegal, dangerous, and not to be depended on. As the Count Palatine did not care to conclude an alliance solely between himself and Henry IV., from fear that the Catholic Estates might side with Spain, the French endeavours remained for the present without result. 'If they persist in leaving me without support,' Henry IV. wrote to Bongars on March 14, 1597, 'I shall be obliged to alter my policy.' [1]

The Emperor was altogether destitute of means for carrying on the Turkish war; even the handsome money contributions of the Pope and the King of Spain were

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 89–102; Ritter, *Geschichte der Union*, i. 70–78.

not sufficient for the purpose. The imperial treasury supplies were partly sold, partly mortgaged; the Hungarian, Bohemian, and Austrian Estates were thoroughly exhausted. The sum spent by the duchy of Carniolia alone against the Turks was reckoned at 7,500,000 florins.[1] The time fixed for paying up the eighty Roman months (about 5,000,000 florins), which had been voted in 1594, would not expire till the end of the year 1600. But the Emperor, 'drained dry,' found himself compelled before this date to ask for a fresh subsidy. On August 27 he issued a summons for a Diet to meet at Ratisbon on December 1.

'Then we shall see again how the princes stand, and if there is still any German blood in their veins,' wrote a thoroughly loyal Lutheran preacher, who unfortunately has not given his name, in a leaflet entitled '*Aufruf zur Heerfahrt wider den Erbfeind christlichen Namens, am Feste St. Michaelis* [29 Sept.], *1597*,'[2] 'or how many of them have already become Italian at heart, or are involved in foreign intrigues which will certainly end in plunging the dear Fatherland in a sea of blood, or are thinking only of their own splendour, and are given up to gluttony and wine-bibbing, gambling, and profligacy, while all the time they boast of the name of evangelicals. Ah me! the beloved Gospel which is used so plentifully for a cloak of shame! Up, up, ye Germans! rouse in your hearts the ancient valour and the ancient loyalty, take pity on the poor Christian people in Hungary and Austria, and

[1] Hutter, ii. 325, note 211. See iii. 388.

[2] *Ein Flugblatt*, 4 S. in 4° (without locality): 'Summons to a campaign against the hereditary foe of the Christian name, on the festival of St. Michael [29 September], 1597.'

do not suffer it to come to pass that Turkish horses should graze in Bavaria, in Saxony, and on the Rhine. Our gracious lord of Saxony is ahead of all in enthusiasm and in olden time sense of honour.'

The Administrator Frederic William did indeed retain his 'olden time sense of honour.' 'He instructed his ambassadors to the Diet to use their influence in the discussion of the Turkish question for smoothing away all mistrust between the Estates and all religious and political controversies, and to have always and only at heart the common welfare of the Fatherland. The Protestant Estates, from a variety of private causes, had lapsed into a state of almost irremediable strife, and many of them were more disposed to join in foreign and civil wars than to combine against the Turks; they seemed possessed with the very baneful notion that Hungary and the Turkish war could not in any way affect the Empire. He for his part was ready to make over to the Emperor in a lump sum the money which was to be spread over two years more, and, in addition to this, to help him with a contingent of troops, and with a money contribution of from thirty to sixty Roman months. It was probable that the Palatiners, on account of the religious grievances, would organise special conferences of the Augsburg Confessionists, and would declare that without the removal of the said grievances they would promise no help; but he, at any rate, had no intention of giving in to such proceedings, for only think of the confusion that would arise if all the imperial Estates behaved in this manner, and were only willing to grant their aids conditionally!'[1]

The Saxon Administrator's assumption with regard

[1] Senkenberg, xxi. 169–177.

to the Palatine Elector proved to have been correct. Although the Elector was of opinion that the Turks 'would certainly seize their opportunity of invading the Empire,' he was nevertheless still determined to make the subsidy dependent on the abolition of the grievances. He also insisted that the defects in the military system must be amended, and negotiations for peace or for an armistice entered into with the enemy. Further, the Emperor must first promise to solicit the support of Spain, and to negotiate with the Pope and the Italian princes for the continuance of their help. On November 9, 1597, Frederic IV., in conjunction with the Margrave of Ansbach, addressed to the Dukes of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel and Lüneburg, Würtemberg and Zweibrücken, and to the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and a few other princes, the recommendations that all, or at any rate some of, the evangelicals must agree together at the Diet that they would not let themselves be bound by the decisions of others respecting the Turkish subsidy.[1]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 104–105.

CHAPTER XI

FROM THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE DIET AT RATISBON IN 1598—CHARACTER SKETCH OF THE PALATINE ELECTOR, FREDERIC IV.

THE Emperor had commissioned his brother, the Archduke Matthias, to open the Diet on December 20, 1597. Not one of the Electors, princes, or counts was present in person. In the address to the Estates Rudolf expressed his thanks for the eighty Roman months voted him in 1594, and for the contingents of troops promised by some of the Circles: he added, however, that the money contributions had either not been paid at all, or not at the right time, and that the troops had only been promised for a few months. He pointed out that it was not in the Austrian dominions only that fresh invasions of the Turks were to be feared, but also in Silesia and in Brandenburg, a substantial standing army would be needed to repulse the attacks effectively. In view of this the Emperor asked that the Estates would either grant him the 'common penny' for five years, or else thirty Roman months annually during five years, and also, in case of extreme need, a supply of troops amounting to 12,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry.[1]

To this demand, however, no one was willing to agree, least of all the Catholic Archbishop of Salzburg,

[1] Senkenberg, xxi. 186–187; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 363–364.

Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau, an extravagant, immoral prelate, who himself required large supplies of money for the maintenance of his concubine, the beautiful Salome Alt, and her children, and for his extensive building operations.[1] 'I question, moreover,' he said, 'if the Empire is in such imminent danger of falling under the Turkish yoke that it is necessary to embark upon this war, and if there were such danger, would all the help we could contribute be sufficient in the long run?' He would only consent to a grant of eight Roman months, and after the example of the Protestant Estates at former Diets, he refused to be bound by a majority of votes in matters of money aids. In a letter to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, who had succeeded to the government on his father's death in October 1597, he excused himself on the plea of poverty: 'This poor unfortunate mountain district is in such a state of insolvency, owing to the great falling-off in the mines, that I dare not at the present juncture promise any considerable sum. I am surely not to blame for not pledging myself to what I may not be able to fulfil.' To this the Duke answered: 'Your excellency may believe me when I say that these extensive imperial subsidies will fall very heavily on me also, owing to a multitude of other obligatory and serious claims that press on me; it is only the imminent danger of our common Fatherland and the desire to save her that makes me consent to the proposed grants.'[2] The Duke instructed his ambassadors to propose forty Roman

[1] Mayr-Deisinger, *Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau*, ii. 37 ff., 96 ff., 183.

[2] Wolf, *Maximilian der Erste*, ii. 139 ff., 150 note. Also see Stieve, ii. 383–386, 410, note 2, 411, note 2, and 262–263, for the reasons which might have determined the Archbishop, ever since 1596, to adopt such a hostile attitude towards the Emperor in the matter of the Turkish subsidy. See Mayr-Deisinger, *Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau*, p. 65 ff.

months, and to make a firm stand against the unconstitutional idea that the decisions of the majority were not binding in matters of taxation.[1]

'Their lord was much concerned,' said the Bavarian ambassadors, 'to think that the right of the majority was to go for nothing, especially in a time of such danger. According both to lay and ecclesiastical law the decision of a majority was binding. Where the conscience was in question, a majority may not be binding; but it was different in questions of money. If the majority had no power whatever, there could be no valid election either of Pope or of Emperor, and nothing more could be settled in matters of state, for the next thing would be that a majority of voters would be disregarded in these also. What would be the result if the example of the Diet was imitated at the provincial assemblies? He begged the Estates not to upset the constitutional principles of the Empire and of all its dominions, and thus sacrifice Germany to the Turks: if anyone had grievances, let him have recourse to the traditional ways.' The Austrian ambassadors also spoke in the same strain. Among the Protestant Estates, Saxony and Pfalz-Neuburg were in favour of the rights of the majority.[2] It was not till February 1598 that the Archbishop of Salzburg gave instructions to his ambassadors to submit to the majority.

After negotiations which lasted for three months, the majority voted a Turkish subsidy of sixty Roman months (about 4,650,000 florins) to be paid up in the course of three years, in addition to the payment of the

[1] See Stieve, ii. 411, note 3, against Ranke's assertion that it was not so much from political as from religious reasons that the Duke insisted on the rights of the majority.

[2] Stieve, ii. 394–395.

outstanding arrears of 2,326,000 florins from former grants. In the Recess of the Diet of April 6, 1598, all rulers were empowered to impose on their subjects, lay and clerical, exempt or not exempt, freed or not freed, taxes proportionate to the amount which they (the rulers) had to contribute. The chapters of the higher benefices, the towns and their resident citizens, as well as the wealthy hospitals, were to be included in this taxation, and all recalcitrants or tardy contributors were to receive suitable punishment. Disobedient and dilatory Estates were threatened with the ban, or with large money fines: in case of necessity the Imperial Chamber was to insure prompt execution of punishment.

But the Protestants could not be brought to unanimous consent. The princes of Zweibrücken, Brunswick, Ansbach, Lauenburg, Baden, Hesse, Anhalt, and the Counts of Wetterau, under the leadership of the Count Palatine, declared that they would not submit to a majority in questions of money any more than in religious matters, and that they would not pledge themselves to any Recess which outstepped the limits of their votes: money contributions should only be granted voluntarily according to the will and means of each Estate individually. Most of the above-named Estates would only promise forty Roman months, and that only on condition that all their religious grievances were first of all redressed.[1]

All through the sitting of the Diet the Protestant Estates held special meetings in the Palatine hostelry, where 'great and daring negotiations' were carried

[1] Senkenberg, xxi. 188 ff.; Sattler, v. 208 ff.; Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 149.

on; but the ambassadors of Saxony, Pfalz-Neuburg, Veldenz, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Würtemberg did not take part in them.[1] The Duke of Würtemberg had instructed his representatives 'in religious matters to side only with the actual adherents of the Confession of Augsburg, and not with the Palatinate or with the Calvinists; from the latter, indeed, they were to separate themselves entirely, for they were only persecutors of the Lutherans, and they were not included in the Religious Peace.'[2] 'Würtemberg and Pfalz-Neuburg'—so the Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony had already reported before the opening of the Diet—'wrote distinctly that they would have nothing to do with the complaints which the Palatine Elector and other Calvinists had concocted.'

A councillor of the Elector of Saxony, in a despatch from Ratisbon, uttered the warning that it was necessary to be well on one's guard against the proceedings of the Calvinists, 'and both for conscience sake, and on behalf of posterity, to consider carefully what was best to be done. It does seem at last that serious measures must be taken. For the *turbulenta consilia* want to go much too far in some things, and the results will be far-reaching. Therefore they must be adequately and seasonably encountered, for the Calvinistic devil is much too obviously to the fore.'[3] With the petition of grievances sent up in the year 1594, the ambassadors of the Saxon Elector would have nothing to do, because the Emperor's dignity was assailed in it, and appeal made to the Estates. 'The Emperor was worried and

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 106.
[2] Sattler, v. 205 ff.; Senkenberg, xxi. 318 note, 489.
[3] Senkenberg, xxi. 319-320.

troubled,' they said, 'with grievances which it was not in his power to remove.' Besides which, the complaints of the Palatiners could not all be satisfied, nor were they all based on right, or even on fact; and they were in part directed against the Emperor, to whom they were all pledged by duty and by oath: their lords had not given them instructions to create all sorts of disturbances, and they would have nothing to do with this business. The Palatiners, it was true, were in the habit of subscribing themselves as adherents of the Augsburg Confession, which recognised the Religious Peace, but their efforts all aimed at the overthrow of this Peace, and at establishing the 'Emancipation.' [1]

Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg-Güstrow was of the same opinion. With regard to the petition of grievances sent up by the Catholics at Ratisbon in 1594, he had taken the opinions of David Chyträus and of the theological faculty at Rostock, and these were in many respects favourable to the Catholics. Chyträus had said that it was above all things necessary to observe the Religious Peace, and not through indiscretion or from other reasons embark on unnecessary schemes in order to augment our power and our possessions. The Catholic Estates, he said, had in some respects good ground for complaints that they suffered detriment from our party with regard to the highly-prized Religious Peace. For instance, Gebhard at Cologne, and others more lately in the bishopric of Strasburg, had violated the express letter of the Religious Peace, and had endeavoured to magnify their own private affairs into a common religious cause in the name of all the Estates

[1] Arumaeus, *Comment. de comitiis*, p. 420; Senkenberg, xxi. 357-360. See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 376-377.

of the Augsburg Confession. It was also true that all manner of sects, especially the Zwinglians and Calvinists, were sneaking in, in opposition to the terms of the treaty. The theological faculty at Rostock had spoken in the same strain—indeed, still more emphatically than Chyträus.[1]

Conformably to this memorandum of advice, Duke Ulrich had already declared before the Diet that it was not advisable to place the Calvinists, by whom the Lutherans no less than the Catholics were persecuted, under the protection of the Augsburg Confession and the Religious Peace. He could not, he said, countenance attacks on the ecclesiastical reservation, which was incontestably part and parcel of the Religious Peace.[2]

A few days before the Recess was signed, the Archduke Matthias received two documents from the Count Palatine and his party, one being an answer to the Catholic refutation of the Protestant grievances, and the other a denial of the Catholic counter-grievances. In the latter it was said that the Catholics make out that the chief ground of the existing mistrust is to be sought in the different sects who are insinuating themselves everywhere under the cloak of the Augsburg Confession. Such an assertion has no other object than to incense the evangelical Estates one against the other. The question at issue is the protection of the Augsburg Confession, which the Pope has condemned and persecuted as heretical, and which has been bitterly assailed in many pamphlets with contempt for the evangelical Estates. The Catholic statement that the Count Palatine had altered the Augsburg Confession was unfounded, for the Elector had done no more than 'rectify some omissions, in accordance with his conscience,' and in

[1] Krabbe, *Chyträus*, pp. 435–437. [2] Stieve, ii. 377.

this he was justified by the Word of God, by the Religious Peace, and by his position in the Empire. The Protestant Estates in their petition of 1594 had called the Pope 'the Babylonian whore, the son of perdition, who exalted himself above God and made out that he was God.' Now they found this as natural as that the Pope, from their pulpits, should be treated 'harshly and rudely,' viz., as the Antichrist and the devil's dregs. They were astonished, they said, that the Catholics should complain of such language, for the Popes had brought more ruin and disgrace on the Empire than any barbarian enemy; even pious bishops had denounced them as precursors of the Antichrist. Besides which the Pope was not an Estate of the Empire, nor was he included in the Religious Peace. The help contributed to Christendom by the Roman See against the Turks could not be reckoned very highly to the credit of Rome, seeing that she drew annually a much larger sum from the Empire, and moreover was in great measure the cause of the Turks having become so powerful. As early as the days of the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa the Estates declared, on the ground of their historical knowledge, that the Pope had been the cause of the inroads of the Turks. In the present day Gregory XIII. had made a fresh assertion of 'the superiority invariably claimed by the Pope over all the Estates of Christendom' by the introduction of a new Calendar, which, according to the evidence of 'several eminent mathematicians,' was incorrect and useless. It was therefore within justice that the evangelicals accused the Pope of being 'an antichristian tamperer with Time.' [1]

[1] Lehmann, pp. 238–251, with Senkenberg's improvements; xxi. 327 ff. See Stieve, ii. 379–380. In the Frankfort, *Reichstagsakten*, p. 87, fol. 206–225.

'Numbers of the Estates are leaving,' wrote the Bavarian Councillor Gailkircher shortly before the close of the Diet, 'very angry and discontented, and it is greatly to be feared that many of them will not agree to contribute the subsidy voted by the majority. In one word, I have observed here so much division of opinion, so much distrust among the Estates, that I can scarcely hope for any good result from this Diet.' [1]

The Count Palatine and his party had stuck firmly to their resolution not to let themselves be bound by the decision of the majority either in granting subsidies, or in any disputes whatever on religious matters. Had the principle they set up, however, gained universal recognition, the result must necessarily have been entire dismemberment of the Empire. Already at Ratisbon several of the Catholic Estates were beginning to declare that, unless a unanimous decision was arrived at concerning the Turkish subsidy, they too could not agree to pay their quotas; for, as was stated in a memorandum from Mayence, 'the burden of the Empire could not be borne by the obedient Estates alone, while the disobedient ones arrogated to themselves freedom to withhold their contributions, and to spend their money on who knows what affairs and intrigues.' [2] If once the resolution against decision by a majority was passed at the imperial Diet, it could not fail to come into operation also at the meetings of deputies, of the circles, and finally, as the Duke of Bavaria had pointed out, at the election diets: the complete disintegration of the Empire was thus imminent.[3]

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 435.

[2] *Mainzer Gutachten* of March 21, 1598, in the Convolut referred to at p. 195, note 3.

[3] Stieve (ii. 430–434) says admirably: 'The Palatiners and their

In order to meet this impending danger, the Catholic and the loyal Lutheran Estates, actuated neither by clerical nor political motives, but solely by desire for the maintenance of the Empire, formed a coalition in favour of decision by majority. The Lutheran Administrator of Saxony was tormented with the fear that it might become necessary to defend the constitution of the realm by force, and other Estates also at the time of the Diet shared this apprehension.[1]

After the close of the Diet the revolutionary party was strengthened by the accession of the new Elector, Joachim Frederic of Brandenburg, the former Administrator of Magdeburg, who had succeeded John George in January 1598. On August 18 he joined the Count Palatine, Zweibrücken, Ansbach, Baden-Durlach, the three Hesses and Anhalt in addressing a document to the Emperor, in which the protest against the Recess was renewed. These princes declared that they would only grant the Turkish aid which they had promised at Ratisbon under certain conditions: they could not consent to any higher demands from the Treasury, nor could they give in to being further taxed under the plea of assent given by a majority of votes, especially as they saw no reason to hope for redress of their grievances.[2]

The Emperor, however, before this document reached

friends succeeded in combating the "majority" from the starting-point of their grievances, for which they hoped, by this means, to get redress more easily. But this question was at bottom not only the means, but also an end, and indeed the principal end. It was the last and necessary consequence of the territorial struggle for complete independence from the Emperor and the Empire' (p. 433).

[1] Stieve, ii. 435.

[2] Senkenberg, xxi. 440–444, and the corrections by Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 86, note 4, and Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 111, No. 1 See also Stieve, ii. 434, note.

him, had given orders to the Estates to conform to the terms of the Recess, and he had instructed his fiscal administrator to summon the delinquents who had not paid their quotas before the Imperial Chamber. When, in consequence of this order, Kurbrandenburg, Ansbach, Hesse-Cassel and Zweibrücken received their summonses, they entered a protest at Spires against the charges of the fiscal board.[1]

The chief blame 'of all the conspiracies' in the Empire was laid by the loyal Estates on the court at Heidelberg, and their bitterness against the latter was all the greater because the Elector Frederic IV., 'in whose name all orders' were issued, was 'a thoroughly worthless prince, a half imbecile lord,' who 'depended entirely on intrigues within and without his territory.'[2]

The Elector was deficient in almost every capacity, certainly in any sort of serious interest in the affairs of government. 'Even those who have the Count Palatine completely in their power,' wrote his secretary Kolbinger to Fabian of Dohna in 1594, 'complain more and more of his insufferable habits; at times he breaks out in abominable blasphemy, and in all manner of abusive language.'[3] He treated his high-minded wife with revolting tyranny and brutality.[4] When the plague devastated the Palatinate in the year 1596, he did not once take the trouble to inquire about the number of the victims and the misfortunes of his subjects.[5]

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 86–87.

[2] So spoke the Administrator of Saxony concerning Frederick, according to a report of Henry Vespermann, the ambassador of the Elector of Mayence, February 22, 1598 (Convolut, see above, p. 195, note 3). The judgment was excellent.

[3] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 48, note 2.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 48, note 4.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 48, note 3.

His own diary and account-book give the best insight into his life and habits. In these we find a minute and continuous record of court dissipations of all sorts; there is almost daily mention of balls, masquerades, hunts and pleasure excursions, together with shameless entries of incessant drinking-bouts and gambling losses. While the most important affairs of state were being transacted at the Diet of Ratisbon in April 1598, the Elector's diary gives the following record of how he spent those days:—

'April 1598: On the 2nd we went to a masquerade dressed in peasants' costume; on the 3rd we danced; on the 4th we went to Mosbach; on the 5th we gambled the whole day; on the 6th we were at Binau, in the house of Hans Landschaden; on the 7th we went to Heidelberg; on the 8th to Hetzen; on the 9th we amused ourselves with running the ring; on the 10th a fox-hunt,' and so forth.[1] In consequence of immoderate drinking he became a confirmed epileptic as early as 1593.[2] Hans von Schweinichen, who was at the Palatine Electoral court for some weeks in 1593 in attendance on the Duke Frederic, writes of this visit: 'We stayed into the third week with the Count Palatine, and the whole time was spent in drinking, eating, and dancing, for he is a most extraordinary lord, and can do nothing else than gorge and swill.'[3] Even at the time of the most important political transactions Frederic could not conquer his craving for drink.[4]

[1] Wille, *Tagebuch*, p. 234 ff.
[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 190, note.
[3] Schweinichen, *Begebenheiten*, iii. 55.
[4] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 50; also *Briefe und Akten*, i. 518, note 1.

The land was 'impoverished by taxes and imposts'—so the Electoral councillor Leonhard Schuy complained; 'drained quite dry, and the Electoral Treasury exhausted by the sale of property;' all the same, 'the Elector played and gambled, as though he and his subjects were the richest of the rich, and he squandered no end of money on his luxuries and amusements.'[1] We give the following entries from his diary and account-book in confirmation of this: 'On August 9, 1599, gambled away 56 gold florins; on the 16th, 14 gold florins, also 60 gold florins; on the 18th, 85 gold florins; on the 19th, 10 gold florins,' and so forth. In the following month: 'September 5, gave 20 florins to a musician; September 10, lost 13 florins in gambling, also 50 gold florins, also 28 florins, also 58 florins; September 12, gave the musicians 10 gold florins; on the 16th, lost 39 gold florins at play; on the 17th, lost 49 gold florins; on the 15th, gave the musicians 15 florins; on the 18th, lost 40 gold florins at play; on the 19th, gave 50 florins for five violins; on the 20th, gave the musicians of Altorf 79 florins, the play-actors of Rotenberg 10 gold florins,' and so forth. In the month of October: 'On the 4th, paid 533 florins for a waxen image, and 400 florins for an artistic painting; on the 5th, for a jewel 300 florins, for a flower for the hair 180 florins, for a casket with rings 2,025 florins; on the 12th, for a heron-house, 111 florins; on the 18th, to the trumpeters at Eberhard von Dalberg's wedding, 20 gold florins; to the miners who sang, 15 florins; on the same day lost 150 florins in gambling; on the 20th, for a chain, 69 florins; on

[1] Report of Henry Vespermann, councillor of the Elector of Mayence, October 13, 1597, from Heidelberg, in the Convolut referred to at p. 195, note 3.

the 21st, for falcons &c., 170 florins; lost 133 florins,' and so forth. On November 1 and 2, the money lost at cards amounted to about 133 florins.[1] French ball-players and lute-players were the most handsomely remunerated, as will be seen from the following entries of the Elector: 'On July 13, 1599, to the French lute-player Books, 10 königsthalers; on the 15th, again 10 königsthalers; on the 16th, again 10 royal thalers; during these days 10 sonnenkronen were lost at tennis, and 50 royal thalers at dice; a monkey was bought for 15 royal thalers.' On the other hand, the sum spent on almsgiving during these same days was not more than three royal thalers.[2]

Frederic's court establishment counted 678 persons, whose sustenance, together with the huge banquets and drinking bouts, swallowed up all the natural resources of the Palatine lands, and there was never any detailed supervision of the consumption in kitchen and cellars. There was a yearly consumption of 400 *fuders*[3] of wine, 2,000 *malters* of corn, 2,500 *malters* of spelt-wheat, and 9,000 *malters* of oats. In the year 1599 the Electoral treasurers announced that the Treasury had lost all credit, and that there was no means at hand for averting unexpected need.[4]

Such was the character of Frederic IV., who, through the agency of his councillors, was 'head and director' of the revolutionary party in the Empire.

For the Catholics, whose complete suppression was the immediate object of this party, it was most

[1] Wille, pp. 265–286.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 254–255.

[3] A measure containing 6 ohms.

[4] See Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 49–50, and *Briefe und Akten*, i. 58–60.

advantageous that the Calvinists and Lutherans should grow more and more embittered against each other.

The events in the Palatinate and in Saxony contributed substantially to this end.

CHAPTER XII

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE PALATINATE—INCREASING CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE CALVINISTS—EXECUTION OF THE CHANCELLOR KRELL IN 1601

THE Palatine Elector Frederic IV. had been forced into Calvinism in his youth,[1] but later on he had believed it to be 'the only way to salvation;' and after the example of his guardian, John Casimir, and his grandfather Frederic III., he had wanted to 'endow his whole land and people, if possible the whole of Christendom, with the blessing of the one pure doctrine.'[2] From the Lutherans of the Upper Palatinate, however, he met with the same resistance as his predecessors had encountered. The town of Neumarkt, where a regular insurrection had broken out, was taken by surprise in the year 1592, and compelled to accept a Calvinistic preacher. In the same year there was a 'considerable rising' in Amberg also, and it was with difficulty that 'the municipal authorities had escaped with life.'[3] In Hambach also there were risings of 'rebellious burghers and peasants, and the authorities

[1] See above, pp. 94-97.

[2] *Äusserungen Friedrichs*, referred to in the letter of Henry Vespermann, quoted at p. 215, note 1.

[3] Already, in 1585, watches had been posted at several places in this town to prevent 'the Calvinistic plague' from getting in. See Schuegraf, *Glossen über ein Zinsbuch der Stadt Amberg*, dated 1585, p. 4.

were subjected to bodily injury.' At Tirschenreuth the chief captain, Valentine Windsheim, threatened the burghers that, if they hesitated any longer in accepting the doctrine of Calvin, he would come down on them with the Landsknechts. But the burghers were beforehand with him, and 'slew him pitilessly as he deserved.' Report says that 'he was thrown from the upper part of a barn on to the floor, and there tortured with cruel blows, cuts, and stabs; then he was taken out into the street, and dragged up and down the market place for a considerable space of time, until at last he was killed without pity from anyone. The insurgents, however, were not even satisfied with this performance, but fell to stamping with their feet on the dead man's body; even the women looked on, delighted at this gruesome act of murder.' Similar atrocities were committed at Nabburg in July 1592. Sebastian Breitschedl, the Calvinist collector of the clerical revenues of this place, had caused a Lutheran lay-preacher to be imprisoned, and had threatened the burghers that, were it not that he wished to spare one or two men, he should reduce the town to dust and ashes. 'In order to prevent his putting such an idea in practice,' some hundred burghers banded together in order to 'give Breitschedl their blessing with their mattocks applied with both hands.' They stormed his house, destroyed everything in it, and 'ransacked it with such ferocity that a heart of stone might have quaked. After a few hours' search they found him under the roof; they crept into his hiding-place, thumped and prodded him with clubs and big poles, and smashed all his limbs in pieces. When they thought he was dead and were all leaving him, he lifted up his

head and tried to crawl out; then the burghers with renewed fury turned round upon him again and belaboured him in a way that cannot be described; one burgher counted 300 wounds on him.' The wretched man was not allowed burial in the churchyard. He was carried half an hour's distance from the town and shovelled into the earth like a dead animal. The plan was to massacre the Calvinist preachers next, but these men saved themselves by flight. The inhabitants of Cham slew their preacher while he was out walking.[1]

Atrocities of this sort, perpetrated not by individuals but by whole communities, showed plainly what universal demoralisation had resulted from the incessant religious conflicts and the reciprocal insults and venomous slanders hurled at each other by Calvinist and Lutheran preachers who called each other from their pulpits 'rascally dogs, hangmen's servants, villains, swine, &c.,' and raged against each in print like maniacs.[2] 'The Calvinists,' wrote Albrecht von Helbach, chaplain at the court of the Lutheran Count Palatine von Simmern, in 1596, 'call our people cannibals, blood-suckers, eaters of the Lord God, cyclopes, Pelagians, keepers of swine, hounds and epicures.'[3]

'An appalling ignorance in matters of the faith, both among preachers and people,' was discovered in the course of a church visitation in 1596. 'Many and terrible deficiencies came to light,' says one of the visitors' reports, 'for very few people—at Hirschau

[1] Wittmann, pp. 91–94; *Verhandl. des histor. Vereins der Oberpfalz und Regensburg*, xxii. 113–117; Schuegraf, *Glossen*, 4.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 94–99.

[3] *Reus trepidans*, p. 61. When the Lutherans pronounced the institutional words over the Lord's Supper, 'the Calvinists would regularly spit out' (Wittmann, p. 98).

only ten—could say the Lord's Prayer correctly.' 'The Articles of the Creed were very badly repeated, most people saying: '*gelitten hat Pontius Pilatus* (suffered has Pontius Pilate), *geponziget unter Pilatus* (*geponziget*, a word made out of Pontius); *der Heilige Geist ist geboren* (the Holy Ghost was born); *die Jungfrau Maria hat gelitten* (the Virgin Mary suffered).' The bulk of the people were not acquainted with the doctrine of Baptism or of the Eucharist, and to the question who Christ was, they could either answer nothing or only at cross-purposes. Most of the preachers had no Bibles, but only Luther's comments, and they spent nearly all their days in taverns. Whereas all church goods and ecclesiastical benefices had been confiscated or squandered, very few of the preachers had adequate incomes; almost every one of them was obliged to carry on some additional trade; one was a shoemaker or tailor, another a barber, a third a linen-weaver, a fourth invited people to funerals or weddings, a fifth went the round of the taverns as musician. The Eucharist was administered in eight different forms. Attendance at church had almost entirely ceased. To an Electoral inquiry of the ecclesiastical councillors and court preachers 'how burgomasters and councillors were to be attracted to church?' the following answer was given: 'Our brethren in religion, by the great bitterness, hatred, envy, and hostility which they bear towards one another, are themselves the cause of all manner of scandal.' 'The burghers are so terribly incensed by their seditious, turbulent preachers, that they are even more hostilely disposed to us than to the devil, and they regard us as no better than baptised Jews and uncircumcised Turks.' 'So greatly are we hated and suspected

by the council and the community that we have reason to lament with bitter tears and sighs that we have become a spectacle to the world, a curse and a rebuke to all mankind.' [1]

Hence it was that a book like Philip Nicolai's '*Kurzer Bericht von der Calvinisten Gott und ihrer Religion*,' [2] which appeared at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1597, had such a wide circulation in the Upper Palatinate and 'excited jubilation among the people.'

Nicolai, 'Minister of the Word at Unna in Westphalia,' compiled the 'Account' for the people in the form of a catechism, in questions and answers, to serve as a faithful warning to 'the simple-minded laity and to God-loving hearts.' He had been prompted to the work by a treatise from a Calvinist preacher which had appeared at Hanau under the title of 'Pseudo-Christ,' and in which the Christ of the Lutherans was made out to be 'an impotent idol of the fancy, a wolf, murderer, Baal and ass' who could not be 'sufficiently execrated and ridiculed.'

'Dear child,' Nicolai wrote, 'if you wish to become a Calvinist, you must first learn to know the Calvinistic Lord God aright.' 'This God,' he blasphemously says, 'has the face of a bellowing ox. . . . The Calvinistic God is to be considered as pure and holy as an angel, even though he allures, entices, and drives all infamous villains and lost . . . rake-hells to all manner of sin, shame, and infamy according to his own will and pleasure.' 'The God of the Calvinists is like an archer: men and women are the arrows, hell is the target into which they are shot.' According

[1] Wittmann, pp. 103–105.

[2] 'Short Account of the Calvinists' God, and of their Religion.'

to their own testimony, 'it was sufficiently evident that their God must be a wanton, lascivious, profligate, cunning, crafty, deceitful and bloodthirsty Moloch.' To the question: 'Do you fully believe that the Calvinists worship and pray to the devil incarnate instead of the living and true God?' the child was to answer: 'I believe it with all my heart and confess it as a certain truth: I will therefore not oppose Dr. Luther in the very least, but I will accept as positive fact what he says in his short account of the Eucharist about these seditious spirits, viz.: that they have "*eingeteufelte, durchgeteufelte, und übergeteufelte* hearts."' To the further question, 'What is the actual dwelling-place of this Lord God?' the answer was: 'Near Calcutta in India, for there the devil is publicly worshipped and prayed to, instead of God, by the heathen people.'

And if the God of the Calvinists was 'the ancient, wicked enemy and accursed Leviathan,' their religion was 'an abomination of desolation in the holy places.'

'Alas!' exclaims Nicolai, 'thou poor, miserable, traduced Germany, sold to the devil, how hast thou thus allowed thyself to be miserably led astray, to be bewitched and blinded, so as to let the godless Calvinist sedition-mongers disseminate their poisonous weeds openly and shamelessly in public books throughout the Church of God; how hast thou pledged thyself to worship the devil henceforth instead of God, and to curse, damn and execrate in the most fearful and abominable manner all those who worship and pray to Jesus of Nazareth!' 'Out of the man Christ Jesus they make a vainglorious trickster. His divine majesty they call a loud-mouthed murderous whore, a stinking carcass,

a monster, and they say . . . that, however much men may curse and jeer at him, they cannot make him as bad as he was.' [1]

In answer to this '*Kurzer Bericht*' the Zürich theologians published a '*Gegenbericht*' in which they declared that Nicolai had blasphemed God and deserved to be put to death. Reineck at Heidelberg insisted that he should 'have his head cut off and not be suffered to live any longer.'

The result was that in 1599 Nicolai published his '*Spiegel des bösengeistes, der sich in der Calvinisten Bücher reget*' ('Mirror of the wicked spirit that pervades the Calvinist books'). Reineck, he said, was a scoundrel and the belch of an ass, a bloodthirsty Cain, and 'the curse of Cain' would 'find out this murderous villain.' The people of Zürich were likewise 'accursed and abandoned blasphemers;' impelled by the divine Spirit, Luther had cursed them all. The God of the Calvinists, he repeated, was 'an accursed Satan, a murderer of mankind from the very beginning;' the Calvinistic spirit was 'a bird of hell.' He enumerated all the terms of opprobrium which the Calvinists had heaped on the Ubiquists: Antichrist, whoremongers and adulterers, Capernaites, cannibals, blood-suckers and Baal-worshippers; their Christ had been called a devouring wolf, a god made of bread, a murderer of souls, a tyrant and an idol.[2]

In a retaliatory pamphlet the Zürichers quoted a number of passages from Luther in which the latter, praised by Nicolai as 'the man of God and the Prophet

[1] Nicolai, *Kurzer Bericht*, Preface, A3, pp. 1, 10, 19, 26, 27, 30, 62 ff., 104, 113, 116.

[2] Nicolai, *Spiegel*, iii. 13 ff., 42, 73, 272 ff., 321–323.

of Germany,' openly taught that 'God dooms to perdition those who have not deserved it.' But if Nicolai held this dogma to be 'devilish doctrine,' it followed that he must consider Luther himself and all Lutherans 'as the representatives of those benighted people who worshipped, prayed to, and adored the devil incarnate instead of the true God.' For 'throughout the whole of Christendom' it was 'known and avowed that the Ubiquists all, through their impious Book of Concord, speak of Luther's book against Erasmus—from which these passages were taken—as a book strictly in accordance with Scripture, and that they conform to it unreservedly.'

'The Holy Scriptures'—so the Zürichers assert—'ascribe to God as the Supreme Cause evil as well as good; and Luther, in controverting Erasmus, wrote and taught concerning this doctrine that "Whereas God rules in all, works in all, and creates all, it follows of necessity that He must work and rule in Satan also, and in impious men."'[1] Professor Affelmann of Rostock, on the other hand, urged later on that, 'Although Luther had used harsh expressions in his book against Erasmus, his language had never been so coarse as that of the Zwinglians who said: "God was the cause of sin; murderers were compelled by God to commit murder; God did not intend all men to be saved."'[2]

Nicolai found a kindred spirit in Jacob Lackner, who, in his '*Fragstücklein*,' to the question: 'How do the Zwinglians and the Calvinists and all who let themselves be seduced by them, stand with regard to God?' answered: 'They are no longer of God

[1] Kurtze, *Abfertigung*, 14b, 17, 20-21.
[2] *Calvinische Heuschrecken*, L. 2-3.

but of the devil. They are open thieves and murderers, as are all seducers; they wallow in the pit of everlasting destruction.' [1]

'Ye dwellers in the Upper Palatinate,' says an anonymous leaflet of the year 1599, 'make known to your Calvinistic prince, who is bewitched by the devil, the written works of Nicolai and other books of the same sort which are all written in the Spirit of God, and make it hot for him if he comes to you again with his false prophets and his courtiers, to teach you his Calvinistic idolatry.' [2]

While the Lutherans in the Empire were profoundly incensed against the Calvinists on account of their conduct in the Upper Palatinate, and the Calvinists were as bitter against the Lutherans for their persecutions in the Electorate of Saxony, the fate of the Chancellor Krell 'came like a thunderbolt on the head of every individual Calvinist.'

The Saxon territorial Estates had petitioned the Administrator Frederick William to the effect that 'the Sacramentarian fanatics, who had incurred the penalty of banishment by their execrable blasphemies, should be treated with the full severity of penal law.' The principal cause, they said, of all the evil was Krell, who had everywhere propagated Calvinistic heresies, had thrust Calvinistic teachers and preachers into the universities, the churches, and the consistory courts; had suppressed the pure doctrine, and 'had been a party to such rigorous proceedings that persecution

[1] Müller, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, ii. 174, 416.

[2] 'Wohlgemeintes Fürhalten an die gottesfürchtigen Christen in der oberen Pfalz' ('Well-meant appeal to the God-fearing Christians in the Upper Palatinate') (*Flugblatt* of the year 1599).

and execution had reached a pitch unheard of for many centuries past.' He had, for instance, 'condemned a pastor, falsely suspected of writing a pasquinade, to three days' torture by burning and hanging on the martyrs' ladder (pillory), he had been more hard-hearted than the hangman, for the latter had had some pity, while Krell had egged him on remorselessly.' He had, moreover, oppressed the subjects, impugned the privileges of the nobles, striven to create all manner of misunderstandings between the Emperor and the Elector, and by wicked, insidious plotting had helped on the disastrous and highly pernicious military schemes of France. Thereby he had, with knowledge and intent, violated the public peace, and acted in opposition to the privileges granted by the Elector to his subjects. Krell, however, denied having been in any way associated with the French enterprise. With regard to the ecclesiastical questions, he said that, according to the terms of the Religious Peace, all the Estates of the Augsburg Confession had the right to regulate Church ritual according to their taste, and that the subjects had therefore no right to complain of the alterations made by the Elector Christian I.[1]

The case was conducted in an irregular manner and dragged on for ten years.[2] During the trial Krell was shut up in a 'small room where rain poured in at four places' and 'all was covered with dirt and

[1] Richard, *Krell*, ii. 181 ff.; Brandes, p. 90 ff.

[2] Fuller details about this law-suit and the verdict given 'by the councillors named by the Emperor Rudolf, who sit on the appellations in our royal castle of Prague,' are given by Richard, i. 170 ff. See Henke, *Peucer und Krell*, pp. 73–79. While it was going through the press, there appeared: B. Bohnenstädt, *Das Prozessverfahren gegen den kursächsischen Kanzler Dr. Nikolaus Krell*, 1591–1601. Compiled from the *Akten des Dresdener Haupt-Staatsarchivs* (Dissertation). Halle, 1901.

vermin.' On September 22, 1601, he was informed that 'it had been fully proved and established by law that he had forfeited body and life by his numberless wicked intrigues and crafty, pernicious proceedings,' and that therefore, as a warning to others, 'justice must be avenged on him' with the sword.

The Elector Christian II., who succeeded to the government in the summer of 1601, sent the preacher of Dohna, Nicholas Blum, and two deacons to Krell in prison, to prepare him for his last journey.

'We put before him,' says Blum, 'the following description, drawn by a Christian prince himself, as Doctor Selnekker writes in his examination, of what a Calvinist really is: "A Sacramentarian is a man who believes and trusts neither in God nor in His Word, who is puffed up with hypocritical sanctity, false wisdom, and a show of peculiar outward righteousness, and who despises and speaks evil of all who are not of his opinion or way of thinking. A Calvinist is a man who robs Christ of His divine Majesty, denies Christ's omnipotence and truth, and opens door after door to the errors of Nestorius, Arius, Mahomet, and the whole of heathendom. The Calvinists fill all kingdoms, principalities, and towns with rancour, hatred, sedition, and gruesome bloodshed, and all that they do they do secretly, craftily, and with misehievous intriguing."'

'The doctor gives here an excellent description,' Blum assured the prisoner, 'both of a secret and of an avowed Calvinist.' That this 'princely description' was true, the Saxon Electorate showed convincingly.[1]

In further conversations the preachers told the prisoner, among other things, that 'the God of the

[1] Blum, *Leichpredigt*, pp. 9–10, 54.

Calvinists was not only the Author of good, but also of evil, that He had willed the fall of Adam and Eve, and that, to-day still, He is the instigator of the sins, vices, and shame which in the Ten Commandments He has forbidden on penalty of temporal pain and eternal damnation. Further, He has decreed the damnation of the greater part of the human race, He has indeed created them for this, He does not intend them to be saved.' This is 'to compare God with the devil.' On hearing such language as this, 'Krell was much moved and exclaimed: "What is this I hear? If there are indeed such abominable people in the world, who teach and assert such things as this, they ought to be swept off the earth; with such as these I do not hold; God preserve me from such people." "There are indeed such people in the world," he was answered, "and that in the very midst of the Church of God. The books of Calvin, Beza, and others teach all this. We wonder, Doctor, that you are not well acquainted with all these doctrines." 'If the Herr Doktor,' they said, "had Calvin's book on Moses, especially his explanation of the third chapter of the first book of Moses, he would in very truth have met there with this horrible teaching. There it is clearly stated that God commanded the serpent to deceive Eve—yea, verily, that God sharpened the serpent's tongue against her, and that He still at the present day draws men as with a rope —nay, drives them—to commit sin." Krell answered: "I remember the colloquy which Jacob Andreä and Beza held together at Montbéliard, and which I read in prison. Beza, I remember, asserted then that God had created the greater part of mankind for perdition. I was at the time greatly shocked by such teaching,

and I rejected it as false and unjust." On Krell's declaring that "he would accept the Formula of Concord," but that he did not approve of the "damnatory clauses" in it, Blum replied: "A true Christian must not only condemn the adversaries, but also curse them." Krell, however, could not receive absolution and partake of the Eucharist, until he had made penitential confession of all his sins and acknowledged the sentence of death passed on him to be just. "Their Electoral Graces wish by God's grace to tread in the footsteps of their laudable Christian forefathers, who held firmly and steadfastly by the legacy of that man of God, Martin Luther; they wish to protect and establish teachers of pure doctrine, to oppose strong resistance to, and exterminate all false teachers, and by God's help to maintain peace and tranquillity in all churches and schools in the Holy Roman Empire and in all their territories; and as for you, Doctor Krell, as a man who has done great injury to his Fatherland, and has helped, with others, to cause much disturbance in the Empire, they intend, before the expiration of two days, to deliver you up to justice, so that everyone may take warning by you. They intend, with this object, to offer you up to Almighty God, just as Isaiah and Jeremiah called the execution of justice on traitors to their country, a sacrifice to the Lord. 'Touch not Mine anointed, says Jehovah, and do My prophets no harm; whoso touches them touches the apple of Mine eye.' You have touched both God and the apple of His eye, His prophets, oftentimes; you have done them an unutterable amount of injury." "To whose help is it due that Luther's Bible has been falsified? Oh, how villainously have God and right conscience been assailed by the treat-

ment bestowed on this book, by the introduction into its pages of all those venomous Calvinistic glosses. This is an immeasurable piece of rascality and cannot be justified." "I confess," answered Krell, "that all this and indeed even more has been done, but I am not the only one to blame; there are many other culprits, especially among the clergy. I did not approve of the falsification of the Bible; it was done at the instigation of the clergy. Those scoundrelly priests, Pierius, Salmuth, Steinbach, Gundermann and so forth, have led me miserably astray: how wrongly I have acted in letting myself be so easily misled and deceived!" Doctor Krell complained vehemently also of such teachers that they not only condemned Christian paintings, but the painters as well.

'When Krell realised that there was no hope for him of acquittal, or of commutation of the sentence, he expressed the wish to confess. "What I now utter in confession," he said, "I utter first and foremost to God in heaven, and to you as His ministers, and I charge you to keep it secret all the days of your life and until the Day of Judgment, as is befitting upright servants like yourselves." Thereupon he made his confession. Blum had no scruples in making it publicly known that Krell had confessed before God and His ministers that he had fully deserved the death he suffered.' [1]

The execution took place at Dresden on October 9, 1601, and the sword used on the occasion bore the Latin inscription: 'Beware, O Calvinist! Doctor Nicholas Krell.' [2]

The widowed Electress Sophia—so says a printed report—'in company with some of the court ladies,

[1] *Leichpredigt*, pp. 11–48. [2] 'Cave, Calviniane: D.N.C.'

went up to the gallery of the new stable buildings, from which they could look down very comfortably at the execution. In order that she might be as close as possible to the spectacle she had given orders that the scaffold, which had been erected a few days before at some distance from the stables, should be taken down and brought nearer.' [1]

After the executioner had struck the blow, he exhibited the head to the crowd gathered round, with the words: 'That was a Calvinistic stroke; his devil's mates had better beware, for we spare no one here. There are more like him in the crowd, methinks, and they'll all come into my clutches.' [2] 'Krell,' said Blum at the end of his funeral sermon, 'has been the cause that the sword of affliction has pierced a hundredfold the souls of the Electoral widow and of other Christians: by the sword therefore he has had his death.' [3]

The second Psalm was parodied by one of the Lutherans and made among other things to declare: 'God has said, Ye Lutherans are My sons, the Calvinists I have not begotten; ye shall bruise them with a rod of iron.' This composition was distributed broadcast among the people. On Palm Sunday in the year 1602, 1500 copies of it were sold at Halle alone in front of the church.[4]

The Elector Christian II. wrote out a form of oath which was to be sworn by all persons, lay and clerical, who were either holding offices or who wanted to enter on some office, and by which they pledged themselves

[1] Leben, *Schicksale und Ende des Dr. N. Krell*, p. 62.
[2] Arnold, ii. 622; Brandes, p. 193.
[3] *Leichpredigt*, pp. 54–55 (Funeral Sermon).
[4] Strobel, *Neue Beiträge*, v. 401.

that they would remain true to the pure doctrine of the Book of Concord, that they would do nothing to oppose it either secretly or openly, and that if they discovered any such intentions in others, they would not conceal the fact, but proclaim it fearlessly. If they should hear that anyone had been enticed by human conceit or delusion to go over from this pure doctrine and knowledge of God, either to the papists, to the Calvinists, or to any other heretical sects, they were at once to inform the Elector and await further decision and orders in the matter.[1] The Elector went so far as to deprive his subjects of the right of law on account of their religion. For instance, on March 26, 1602, he inhibited Doctor Solomon Blattner from entering on a lawsuit because 'he belonged to the Calvinist sect.'[2]

[1] Kiesling, p. 215.

[2] Brandes, pp. 196–197.

CHAPTER XIII

PAPAL ENDEAVOURS TO FORM A LEAGUE AGAINST THE TURKS—SPANIARDS AND DUTCHMEN IN THE EMPIRE —AN UNFORTUNATE EXECUTIVE EXPEDITION IN 1599—AN ENCROACHMENT ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE EMPIRE, 1600

FROM the time of the Diet of Ratisbon in 1598 the internal troubles of the Empire had increased with every year. The Emperor could do nothing 'against all the growing anarchy but issue commands, citations, and commissions, to which very few paid any attention, for he was constantly involved in wars with the Turks which devoured enormous sums. The minister of imperial finances, Zacharias Geizkofler, pushed on the work of tax-gathering with indefatigable zeal.[1]

[1] See J. Müller, 'Die Verdienste Zacharias Geizkoflers um die Beschaffung der Geldmittel für den Türkenkrieg Rudolfs II.' in the *Mittheil. des Österreich. Instit.* 1900, pp. 251–305. Müller's researches show that the imperial and circle contributions of 1594–1598 amounted to 2,464,483 florins, to which were added 839,340 florins of extraordinary aid from individual Estates, making the total sum 3,303,823 florins—*i.e.* almost exactly as much as the collective amount of the five-yearly imperial contributions. With the exception of different mid-Rhine Estates, such as Mayence, Hesse, Spires, and Frankfort, the Estates of the Tyrol and Western (Suabian) Austria had contributed the chief part of the 'extraordinary aids.' Considering the great influence of Z. Geizkofler in these particular districts, owing both to his having distinguished relatives in high positions, and to his personal connection with the territorial lords, the Archdukes Ferdinand and Maximilian, we shall not be far wrong in saying that it was due finally to Geizkofler's personal influence on the leading personages of the Tyrol

On May 2, 1598, through the mediation of Pope Clement VIII., peace was concluded between France and Spain at Vervins. After this, hope began to be entertained at Rome that 'now at last all the Christian states would combine together in a league against the Turks.' [1] Ever since 1596 the Pope had been exerting himself to form a league of this sort,[2] and had

and of Suabian Austria that these regions contributed so much the largest proportion to the costs of the war. These calculations of Geizkofler remove, indeed, all doubt concerning the significant fact that the dues were paid up unequally, and to a great extent very slowly; but they also prove indisputably that the money, even if sent in slowly and irregularly, was finally paid up with a very unimportant deficit. The deficit, however, which after all would have arisen from the negligence of some contributors, was more than made up, on the showing of the official accounts, by the so-called 'extraordinary aids' of a few specially patriotic individual Estates. Thus it commonly stood at the end of the sixteenth century with the imperial and Circle-subsidies—spoken of for the most part so contemptibly, though with the contributions from the imperial hereditary lands of 1593–1603, they amounted to no less than 20,691,837 florins (according to a list in the exchequer), and this made it possible for Rudolf II. to carry his great Turkish war to an abundantly successful issue.

[1] See Duplessis-Mornay, vii. 538, and viii. 268; Ranke, *Päpste*, ii. 299–300. The ambassadors of England and of the States-General had taken no end of trouble to hinder the peace of Vervins, but Henry IV. had agreed to it on account of the utter exhaustion of France (see Ranke, *Franz. Gesch.* ii. 33–34). The country had become almost a desert; the number of inhabitants had diminished by 3,000,000 during the civil war (Report of the Venetian Peter Duodo of 1598, in Albéri, Appendix 157). At the end of March Villeroy communicated to the States' ambassador, Oldenbarnevelt, the French King's firm resolve to accept the peace, adding, however, that 'it is the King's intention only to abide by it until such time as France should have recovered her strength. Oldenbarnevelt received this information in a confidential interview from the lips of Henry himself; 'he would require three or four years to order and develop the resources of his kingdom, and during this time the Netherlands must carry on the war alone; he would not desert them, however; troops and engineers should always be at their disposal, and he would reimburse the money which they had advanced him; at the end of this time he hoped to take up the war again with renewed energy and under more favourable circumstances' (Wenzelburger, ii. 693).

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 248, note 1.

himself expended about one and a half million scudi for the Turkish war.[1]

On May 28, 1598, he stimulated Henry IV. to embark on a campaign against the hereditary enemy,[2] and was confident at least of seeing France, Germany, and Poland united in a league. Henry again repeated the promise that he would set sail from Venice and, like the French crusaders, come down upon the enemy of Christendom at Constantinople; but, 'in reality, he could not break away from the Turks.' He still clung firmly to the idea, which he had again expressed in a letter to the Sultan on September 30, 1597, that 'complete friendship between France and the High Porte had always been of the greatest advantage to both States.'[3] In March 1599 he informed the Elector Palatine Frederic IV. that he had repudiated the League wished for by the Pope, and that he left it to Frederic to consider what might lurk behind this League. In spite of the peace of Vervins he egged on the Protestant princes to ally themselves with the States-General against the King of Spain, and assured the former of his full support in such a case.[4]

For many years past Spaniards and Hollanders had occupied the Lower Rhine and Westphalia, and

[1] Ranke, *Päpste*, ii. 302.

[2] Duplessis-Mornay, ix. 27.

[3] Berger de Xivrey, iv. 856–857.

[4] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 155, 213, No. 32. He had already written to the Duke of Würtemberg on June 26, 1598, that now, after having concluded peace with Philip II., he hoped in a short time to bring his kingdom into such good order that he might be able to be of use to his friends and good neighbours who had more than once supported him (Berger de Xivrey, iv. 1012–1013). Between 1587 and 1595 the Duke of Würtemberg had handed out 756,000 livres for Henry IV. (iv. 463–464, note).

'had behaved as though they were the actual lords of the people.'[1]

The States-General had on one occasion given orders to the magistrate at Emmerich to turn the Jesuits out of the town within three days, or else they would themselves 'drag them out by their heads' and treat them in such a manner 'that their wives and children would shriek and scream.' On the council's refusing to obey the order, the whole neighbourhood was robbed and plundered to the 'utter ruin of the poor subjects.'[2] 'We, here on the Rhine, are entirely forsaken by the Emperor and the Empire,' wrote Canon William of Breuers, on September 19, 1597; 'words cannot describe what we have to suffer to-day from the Dutch, to-morrow from the Spanish troops, or how they pillage, burn, and extort contributions; great stretches of land lie wholly uncultivated, numbers of peasants have taken flight; hunger and want have crushed untold numbers; pestilential diseases are carrying off thousands; I do not know if anywhere in the Empire there is another land as unhappy as ours;

[1] In a memorial of Count Arnold of Bentheim, of the year 1594, concerning a Spanish officer, we read as follows: 'Several captains we could mention have amused themselves with ridiculing and poking their fun at the German Protestant Electors and princes, and at the coats of arms which are displayed on their sealed letters, speaking in this wise: "We see here fearful and horrible animals, lions, and such-like, with feet and claws uplifted, and with mouths distended to their jaws; but we do not see that they have scratched or bitten anybody." Others are heard to say that there is not the slightest danger that the German princes will oppose any resistance to the belligerent troops, for they are not at unity among themselves, and they do not allow themselves to be troubled at heart about anything which does not concern themselves; all they care for . . . is to get the money together and spend their time in hunting, carousing, and gambling' (see Falkmann, pp. 74–75, note).

[2] *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, iii. 367–368.

although we have nothing to do with the war of the Spaniards and Hollanders, we become the booty of the contending parties.' [1] Other testimonies coincide with this lamentation. In May 1597 the Cologne coadjutor Ferdinand, in an appeal to the territorial Diet, demanded that, in considering the question of subsidies, it should be remembered 'that in these precarious times the country people, owing to the daily robbing, plundëring, and horse-stealing they were subject to, were so greatly exhausted that they had nothing left over but their empty stomachs.' 'The presumption of the States was inordinate,' wrote Ferdinand to Duke Maximilian on November 5, 1597; 'it had come to such a pitch that there was scarcely anyone in the world for whom they had any respect.' 'If God does not succour us,' he complained to Duke William on December 6, 'I see no help anywhere; for since they have prospered so greatly the States have become so intractable that they think nothing can thwart them.' [2]

Both the belligerent powers had conquered strong places in the Empire, and the Dutch in 1597 had taken possession of the two important towns of Rheinberg and Mörs, which till then had been in the hands of the Spaniards. In order to recover the Spanish possessions in the Rhinelands taken by the Dutch, Francis of Mendoza and Count Frederic Berg equipped an army of 21,000 foot and 2,500 horse, consisting of Spaniards, Walloons, and Germans, advanced in September 1598 into the Duchy of Cleves, and succeeded by the middle of October in driving the Hollanders out of the fortress of Rheinberg. The troops poured into the country on both

[1] 'Abschrift' in a *Codex eccl. Xantensis saec. xvii.* fol. 11–12.
[2] Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, Abt. iii. 479–480, 541, 549–550.

sides of the Rhine, over the Münster land and into the county of Mark, and by incendiarism, pillage, and atrocities of all sorts filled the defenceless inhabitants with terror and consternation.[1]

'They have reduced this archbishopric and the unfortunate subjects,' the coadjutor Ferdinand complained, 'to utter ruin, and have driven most of the people away into misery, so that now in many places there are no more peasants to be found, or at any rate very few.'[2] Mendoza restored the Catholic worship in Wesel; the preachers were dismissed from office by the magistracy, and the churches again taken possession of by the Catholics and Jesuits introduced, and it seemed as if the principal strongholds of the Protestants in these regions were permanently broken.[3] The Dutch also pressed into the Duchy of Cleves, burning and devastating the land and venting special fury on the priests and monks. The Emperor, engrossed with the Turkish war, issued threats after threats against the Spaniards and Hollanders, demanded evacuation of the imperial territory, and compensation for damages, under penalty of the ban, but all to no effect.

Mendoza's intervention encouraged the Count Palatine and his followers to hope that now at last it would be possible to involve the Empire in a war with Spain, and, with the support of France, England, and

[1] Concerning the invasion of the Spaniards in the Netherrhenish-Westphalian Circle, see Keller in *Sybels Hist. Zeitschr.* 63, p. 230 ff., and *Gegenreformation*, ii. 57 ff., 265 ff.; Crecelius in the *Zeitschr. des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, N.F. xiv. 22 ff., and also Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, Abt. iv. 16.

[2] Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, Abt. iv. 17.

[3] Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 61–62, 210 ff., 212 ff., 214 ff., 216 ff., 219 ff., 222 ff.

Holland, to bring about the long-contemplated revolution in the Empire.

Mendoza, the Estates declared, had terrible designs in view.

'The plans and measures of the Papal League are made manifest by the invasion of the Spaniards,' wrote Frederic IV. at the end of October 1598. 'The Spaniards are to carry out the papal plans for the enforcement of the Tridentine decrees,' said the Landgrave Louis of Hesse-Marburg; 'the Spaniards mean to be lords of the Rhine, to establish the monarchy'—universal dominion—'and to carry out the decrees of the Tridentine Council,' said the Duke of Zweibrücken.[1] 'From the words and actions of the Protestants,' the Bavarian councillor Metternich wrote from Spires to Duke Maximilian on March 29, 1599, 'this much at any rate is clear, that the Protestant Estates would gladly have a King of the Romans under whom they could establish their own religion, religious emancipation, and all that appertains thereto.' 'In short it is the Catholic religion and ecclesiastical property that they are mostly concerned about, and they would gladly bring matters to such an issue as to leave themselves masters throughout the whole Roman Empire.' 'Their arguments are many:' the Emperor was not in the Empire and did not protect it, least of all against the Spaniards; he had several times issued important edicts to the detriment of the Calvinistic and Augsburg Confessions, as for instance at Aix-la-Chapelle and at Strasburg. 'Added to this there are all sorts of wild conjectures afloat—the Imperial Majesty is said to have contracted alliances with Spain, with

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 113, 115, 119, 121, 137.

the Pope, with the Italian princes, with Catholic Electors and princes in the Empire, in order to suppress the Protestants and eradicate their religion.' [1]

Under the leadership of the Count Palatine a conference was held at Frankfort-on-the-Main in March 1599, concerning war against Spain and the formation of a Protestant union. Representatives were sent to this assembly by Kur-Brandenburg, Neuburg, Zweibrücken, Ansbach, Brunswick, Lüneburg, Hesse-Cassel, Hesse-Marburg, Hesse-Darmstadt, Baden-Durlach, Anhalt-Dessau, Öttingen, and the Counts of Wetterau. A meeting had already been held for the same object in December 1598. The Administrator of Saxony had been invited to it, but had refused to take any share in the matter. 'Many of the Estates,' he wrote to the Elector of Brandenburg, 'disregarding the laws of the realm, have allied themselves with the powers which are fighting in the Netherlands, and these traitors now treat their own compatriots as enemies. The excesses of the Spaniards are grievous enough, but the States-General wrest whole territories from the Empire, encumber its rivers with arbitrary tolls, obstruct all communication, execute judgment against members of the Empire in matters which are under the jurisdiction of the Emperor and the Imperial Chamber, and even spurn the Empire itself when it seeks to bring them to obedience and to pacific negotiations. If, as it appears, there is no prospect of peace, the judicial ordinances must be enforced against this revolutionary proceeding. An assembly of evangelical Estates will fill the Empire with schism and mistrust. It has always been considered that meetings of this sort are acts of defiance against

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 472, note 2.

the Emperor and the imperial Recesses, and that they give rise to counter-alliances, because the neighbouring powers profit by them to subject the Empire to themselves.'[1] Frederick William recommended that proceedings should be taken against both the Spaniards and the Hollanders.

This, however, was by no means the intention of the Estates assembled at Frankfort. In the month of March it was decided by a majority of votes that a body of 6,000 men were to be recruited, and to be sent forthwith against the Spaniards; but that, with regard to Holland, 'friendly relations' were to be negotiated. The King of Denmark, as co-possessor of Holstein, was to be solicited to take part in the campaign, and England was to be appealed to for support of the enterprise. If the Emperor attempted to hinder the expedition, his commands were to be disregarded: force must be opposed to force. Benefices and towns which did not volunteer assistance were to be compelled to contribute money aids; by force or otherwise subsidies were to be obtained from the ecclesiastical institutions. If things came to war against the Emperor, then, said Prince Christian of Anhalt, 'it will be a matter of playing for the skin of the ecclesiastical Estates.'[2]

Of his princely co-confederates Christian had no very high opinion. 'The heads of our party,' he wrote to his wife, 'not only lead irregular lives, but the most abominable lives in the world;' the Margrave George Frederic of Ansbach especially, he said, was 'only a preceptor in drunkenness and vice.'[3]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 130.

[2] '. . . de quorum corio luderetur' (Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 167).

[3] '. . . les principaulx des nostres mesnent une vie pas seulement desordonnée, mais aussy la plus detestable du monde.' '. . . Estant

'The wild imaginings' of which Metternich spoke were actually accepted, or used as pretexts, by Christian as if there really were question of establishing a Catholic universal monarchy with a view to the annihilation of Protestantism and of 'German liberty,' and this at a time when the Emperor was 'quite helpless and forlorn,' and at enmity with Spain; when the Catholic portion of the imperial Estates was intimidated and wanting in any sort of cohesion, and when Spain was in a condition of constantly increasing deterioration.[1]

In order to prevent the establishment of a Catholic universal monarchy and to avert their own annihilation, Christian recommended that the Protestant Estates should not only unite together in a league among themselves, but should also enter into alliance with all the foreign enemies of the House of Habsburg. The annihilation of this House and of the Catholic faith was the actual object which Christian contemplated by means of this proposed league. After having agreed with the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Cassel to draw France, England, and Holland into the league against Spain, he sent ambassadors to Henry IV. and Elizabeth, and entered into alliance with the Dutch also. Christian himself, at the beginning of April 1599, egged on the French King to renew the war against Spain, telling him that the German princes would back him up and elect him 'Protector of Germany.'

seulement precepteur de boire et de vices' (Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 153, 170, note 3).

[1] For the causes of the Emperor's hostility with the Spanish King, see Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, pp. 25 ff., 34, 111–112. 'At Prague there is almost less hostility towards the Turks than towards the Spaniards,' wrote the Archbishop of Salzburg in the year 1602.

The French King, however, did not think the time had yet come for this step, as the transactions at Frankfort had had a melancholy issue. Rank schism had broken out among the Estates at the meeting, and neither the contemplated Union nor the evangelical campaign against Spain came to pass.

Meanwhile the Landgrave Moritz, in the hope of being nominated commander-in-chief of the campaign, had already recruited troops, and he now demanded adequate compensation for the large expenditure it had cost him. First of all he conceived the idea of offering his troops to the Turks, but he gave up this plan on the representation of the French ambassador Bongar that he had better not place the troops at the disposal of one whose aims against the Landgrave himself and against 'German liberty' would be assisted by their means. He then offered them to the Dutch; but, before their affirmative answer had reached him, he found another use for the forces: he decided to lead them into the Westphalian circle in the name of the circle of the Upper Rhine.

His pretext for adopting this course was a resolution passed by the Protestant Estates at a Diet at Coblentz, when the representatives of the five outer circles had met together and had decided to enforce the execution of the imperial decrees against the belligerent powers.

By the middle of April Mendoza had already withdrawn all the Spanish troops from Westphalia, and he merely retained in his power a couple of Clevish towns to cover his retreat from Holland; even these he promised to surrender if the Dutch would abandon their German possessions. But the Coblentz resolution

was not recalled. Moritz, who, with a view to relieving Hesse, had arbitrarily placed his troops in the Catholic bishoprics of Hersfeld and Fulda, advanced in May into the bishopric of Paderborn. The Margrave of Ansbach had in March, equally gratuitously, quartered part of his mercenaries in the territory of the bishopric of Würzburg, and he too now marched into Westphalia. The Duke of Brunswick also repaired thither with his forces.

The Catholics were seized with great consternation.[1]

At the Electoral Court of Mayence there seemed 'no doubt whatever, according to all that had been gathered concerning secret intrigues and embassies, that a league between the princes—who were already in the field—and their adherents, and France and the Estates of the Netherlands, was on the eve of settlement, if not already concluded.' 'And then,' the Elector of Mayence represented to the Administrator of Saxony, 'the Empire itself will be overthrown, and we defenceless Estates, together with our subjects, shall be sacrificed to the fury of war.' The Administrator replied that he too could not but entertain the same fears, but promised, 'in case of extremity, to lend loyal help in defending the Estates that were unconstitutionally and unjustly oppressed.'[2] Reports

[1] 'The fire that has been kindled is spreading far and wide,' said the Coadjutor Ferdinand on May 16, 1599: 'it is also to be feared that the Catholic Estates in the Empire will suffer most from it.' A fortnight later he wrote word of reports that the princes were advancing on the Rhine, and that they would first give the Spaniards a beating and then punish the priests. He complained that the Catholics in the Empire, especially the ecclesiastical princes, were not bestirring themselves at all in the matter, and feared that his archbishopric, the House of Bavaria, and the Catholic religion were threatened with the greatest danger (Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, Abt. iv. 19).

[2] *Kurmainzische Vorstellung und Bericht über eine Audienz bei Friedrich Wilhelm*, July 3, 1599.

were already rife concerning plots to depose the Emperor and his House; on the part of the Austrian Protestants threats were loud that they would seize the first opportunity for shaking off the Habsburg yoke; the Palatine Elector, it was said, with the help of the Moravian nobility, was asserting his right to the throne of Bohemia, and wanted also to become King of the Romans.[1] The Protestant Estates of Bohemia declared plainly that, if necessary, they would resort to force to assert their claims and to free themselves from the Habsburgers. The Venetian ambassador at the Imperial Court at Prague feared the worst for the Catholics in Bohemia.[2]

As early as February 28, 1599, the Bavarian councillor Otto Forstenheuser had written from Spires to Duke Maximilian that 'the Protestant assessors in the Imperial Chamber had declared that as the Spaniards had now been driven not only off the imperial soil but also out of the Netherlands, and that France, Holland, and Zealand had become protectors of German liberty, it was now all over with the whole Roman Empire, and the long-cherished aim of the Protestants was at last accomplished.'[3]

The troops of the three princes who were to execute the imperial warrants in Westphalia conducted themselves in such a manner against the defenceless inhabitants that the Estates of the Westphalian circle decided at the end of May that 'these intrusive friends of the

[1] Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, pp. 28–29, 120.

[2] Stieve, *Verhandl.* pp. 61–77. '. . . se poco poco caminano le cose più innanzi, potrebbono li cattolici correr in questo paese una grand borasca; che Dio ci guardi,' wrote the ambassador Duodo on November 13, 1600, to the Doge of Venice.

[3] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 472, note 2.

circle must at once take their departure.' Landgrave Moritz in his 'war articles' had only recommended to mercy 'pregnant women, women with new-born babies, maidens, and *evangelical ministers*.'[1] Thanks to the exertions of the three princes the highest posts of command in the army were filled with officers who till then had served under the Dutch and who were made over to the princes by the Estates-General; part of the army was actually placed under the pay and in the service of the latter. In July the troops moved forwards in the direction of the Rhine. The generals, at the end of August, began the siege of the town of Rees on the Lower Rhine, which was occupied by the Spaniards. Hitherto they had only received secret supplies of artillery and other material of war from the Estates-General, but they now resolved to ally themselves with them openly and to appeal to Prince Maurice of Orange for an auxiliary army of from 4,000 to 5,000 men. Before, however, the demand was made known to the Prince, the Spaniards, on September 10, successfully surprised the Hessian camp. Three days later the whole of the besieging army was in a state of complete disruption. The mutinous soldiers tore in pieces numbers of their flags and would not submit to being taken out of the Empire into Dutch service. The German town of Emmerich was made over to the Hollanders by the German troops; by the end of the year the Spaniards had evacuated every place in the Empire except the fortress of Berg.[2] The disastrous termination of this expedition for the enforcement

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 472, note 2.

[2] Fuller details in Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 100–148; Stieve, ii 502–503; Pieler, p. 213 ff.

of the imperial ban afforded Henry IV. the opportunity for making the Protestant Estates, who were hostile to the Emperor, more apprehensive of any future attacks from their now more powerful adversaries, and for stimulating them to help the Dutch and to form an alliance which he himself would join later on. 'His inclination to the reformed religion,' he informed the Palatine Elector in February 1600, 'was not diminished by his profession of Catholicism; he intended still to support the reformed Estates.' [1]

In the same month representatives of the Count Palatine, and those of Ansbach, Hesse-Cassel, and Brunswick, met together at Frankfort-on-the-Main in order to make a fresh attempt at forming a union. Their efforts, however, fell through. But the Estates resolved unanimously, on February 14, that 'not only in religious matters and in questions of subsidies for foreign kingdoms (*i.e.* for the Emperor to make war against the Turks), but also in the framing of new laws or in the application of old ones the minority must not be bound by the majority.' The resolution declared that it was neither 'in accordance with the Divine Word, nor with ancient traditions, to let themselves be constrained in these matters by the votes of the majority.' [2]

This measure was a further encroachment on the constitution of the Empire, and led to fresh complications and contests.

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 220–221.

[2] In the *Archivium Unito-Protestantium*, App. 55.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DISPUTE OVER THE FOUR CONVENTS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR THE EMPIRE, 1600–1601

At the Ratisbon Diet of 1598 it had been decided that on the following February 1 a meeting of deputies should be held at Spires for the purpose of remedying the numerous defects in the system of justice. Since the year 1588 the Emperor had suspended the regular visitations of the Imperial Chamber because he did not recognise the *locus standi* of the Protestant Administrator who would necessarily have taken part in them. The meeting of deputies was now to undertake this work of visitation, with special attention to the revision of the verdicts of the Imperial Chamber, the number of which amounted to thirty-seven. Four of these sentences referred to convents which had been confiscated by Protestant Estates since the conclusion of the Passau Treaty, and for this reason the Count Palatine and his followers had contrived to get the transactions of the meeting postponed to June 1600. At the Frankfort assembly of Protestants, of March 1599, Frederic IV. had actually proposed that the deputies should not meet at all.

The first of the four convents in question was the nunnery at Frauenalb, of which the Margrave of Baden-Durlach and the Count of Eberstein had taken possession in 1598. A judgment of the Imperial Chamber had

insisted on the restoration of this convent; but the offenders had appealed against this decision, contesting its validity and maintaining in self-justification that the Religious Peace annulled episcopal jurisdiction in the territories of Protestant princes, and thus left them free to confiscate convents and ecclesiastical property.

Matters stood on the same footing with regard to the Carthusian convent at Christgarten, the Magdalen convent at Strasburg, and the convent of the Carmelites at Hirschhorn. The first of these three had been confiscated by the Count of Öttingen, the second by the town council, the third by imperial Knights of Hirschhorn. In all these cases, also, the Imperial Chamber had decided in favour of the plaintiffs, and the opposite party had insisted on revision.

Now, in all the committees of the Imperial Chamber in which the four disputed sentences had been passed, the Protestant assessors had formed the majority; in the Öttingen case four Protestants and only two Catholics had given the verdict. Protestants and Catholics alike maintained before the Imperial Chamber that the Treaty of Passau and the Religious Peace had inhibited Protestant land-owners from protestantising all convents in their dominions which were not yet in their possession, and from appropriating their goods.[1]

The decisions of the Imperial Chamber were regarded by the Counts Palatine and their party as 'an inhuman and unchristian blow' struck at the whole existence of the new evangel. They must either, said the Count Palatine's councillors, submit to the decisions of the Imperial Chamber—and this would bring on the down-

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 183–195.

fall of Protestantism—or else force would be opposed to justice, and the discord and schism in the Empire would find vent in a civil war. If the Religious Peace was interpreted according to the sense of the Imperial Chamber, the Count Palatine alone would sustain a loss which could not be balanced by millions of gold florins. Moreover, it was not merely a question of property already in possession, but also of all goods that 'should fall in in future.' [1]

At the Protestant assembly at Frankfort in 1599 the Estates had advised the Count of Öttingen to persist in demanding revision of these verdicts, and also to insist that the revisers should represent both religions in equal numbers. The Count followed this advice, and the three other Estates on whom sentence had been passed demanded in like manner an impartial revision by a similar committee. Soon, however, the alarm gained ground that an exhaustive examination of the documents might lead the Lutheran revisers, possibly also the delegates from Saxony, Pomerania, and Nüremberg, to take the same view as the Protestant assessors of the Imperial Chamber. The councillors of the Count Palatine therefore settled that 'whereas the four disputed cases were matters connected with religion, the decision of the Imperial Chamber and that of the revisers must both be rejected, and the matters referred to an imperial Diet. If the deputies at Spires would not agree to this, the Protestant princes must recall their delegates, telling them that the right of confiscation of ecclesiastical property was inevitably bound up with the right of reform. Frederic IV. took the

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 197; *Briefe und Akten*, i. 239, 240, No. 145.

opportunity of an infant baptism at Cassel to endeavour to win over the Landgrave Moritz and the Administrator of Saxony to this opinion. He was not successful, however. These two princes did not wish to see the last links of imperial cohesion broken by a complete shattering of imperial justice, and they would not go beyond asking for an impartial committee of revision.[1] Most of the Palatine councillors, however, urgently dissuaded their Elector from this course. Nothing would be gained, they wrote to Frederic IV. on September 10, by 'an impartially constituted committee which no doubt the papists would be quite willing to allow before giving up the whole case; but, on the contrary, the Protestant revisers would in all probability confirm the sentence of the Imperial Chamber.' 'It has come to our knowledge that there are some among the evangelical revisers who, although otherwise sound in their religious views, nevertheless, owing to the report they have heard at Spires, think themselves bound by duty and conscience to vote in the same way as did the evangelical assessors of the Imperial Chamber when the judgment was given. We therefore urge that the Elector give no heed herein to Saxony and Hesse, but that he persist in the resolve to repudiate the decision altogether.'[2]

Prominent among the Protestant revisers who in this dispute were on the side of the Catholics was Doctor Leonard Schug. As electoral councillor he had for many years been a zealous advocate of the Palatine policy; but when he was summoned to Spires to assist in the revisions, a closer inspection of acts and docu-

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 200–201.
[2] In the *Archivium Unito-Protestantium*, App. 77–81.

ments brought him to the conviction that the right of confiscation claimed by his party could not be brought into harmony with the terms of the Pacification of Augsburg. In November 1600 he wrote as follows to the Elector Frederic: 'The undoubted literal meaning of the Religious Peace to which Emperor, Kings, and Estates have all so solemnly pledged themselves, must lay as hard a necessity on a conscientious reviser to decide against the evangelicals in this point as it laid on the Kamerales, *i.e.* the Protestant assessors at Spires. However well-intentioned these revisers may be towards the reformed religion, and however much they may wish to judge differently, they cannot conscientiously do so. The Religious Peace is no more advantageous for us in this place than in others. I see that Saxony and Brandenburg, in 1555, in spite of the most elaborate and skilful endeavours, could not get beyond this meaning.' The idea of the Protestant Estates, he said, to deprive the Imperial Chamber of the right of judgment in religious questions, and to refer this matter to a Diet, was neither 'advisable nor practicable.' The Protestants themselves had repeatedly appealed to the decision of the Imperial Chamber in disputes connected with the Religious Peace. This had been especially the habit of the Elector's own grandfather, Frederic III. When the Emperor and all the Estates at the Augsburg Diet of 1566, and at later Diets, had ordered this prince to restore the bishoprics of Sinsheim and Neuhausen to the Bishop of Worms, Frederic had said that he considered this order invalid, for 'the matter was not the concern of the Diet but of the Imperial Chamber.' In the terms of the Religious Peace itself, it was strictly enjoined on the tribunal of

the Imperial Chamber that it must pronounce its judgments in accordance with the said Treaty of Peace. The Emperor and the papists would 'exultantly praise the text of the Religious Peace' where it says: 'The judges and assessors of the Imperial Chamber shall be bound to give to all appealing parties due and necessary assistance of the law, in strict accordance with this Treaty of Peace, and independently of their religious opinions.' If anyone should reply, 'All right, but in a doubtful case,' his reply would have no force, for even the Protestant members of the Imperial Chamber did not allow 'that anything was doubtful in the Religious Peace, especially in the passages from which the four present religious cases had been decided.' 'And verily,' Schug reiterated, 'no impartial person could say anything else.' [1]

[1] 'Schreiben und Gutachten von Schug' in the *Archivium*, App. 97–102, 134–142, 172–179. *Cf.* Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 202–204. The Protestant jurist Senkenberg, xxi. 653, note m and 22, 17, remarks that Schug's memorandum made it as clear as daylight that the Protestants were wrong: his opinion is 'the unvarnished impartial utterance of a man utterly unbiassed by religious or political considerations, and speaking only from a sense of justice and according to the dictates of conscience.' In a memorandum on the complaints of the Protestant Estates and the counter-complaints of the Catholics, Leonard Schug wrote to the Elector Frederic IV. on January 15, 1601: 'There is no need for all this talk; among the evangelists of both creeds there are not a few—and those not the least important—who hold, and hold truly, that the Religious Peace inclines rather to the side of the papists, and that the papists, in the most important point of the question at issue, are more favoured than we are.' Should the evangelicals wish to meet the accusation of the Catholics 'of daring, contrary to the Reservation in the Religious Peace, to take over and reform bishoprics, benefices, and religious houses,' they will find it hard to produce better arguments than the long-exploded *interposita protestatio post actum* and the prohibited declaration of Ferdinand. There is no way out of it. God grant that the evangelicals may keep and properly administer the churches and schools, of which they have undisputed possession, until it pleases Him to send better means, rather than, as has unfortunately so often been the case, to go counter to the religious pacifica-

Another of the Palatine Elector's councillors also gave it as his opinion that, in the matter of the four convents, right was on the side of the Catholics, and that, as regards the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the Religious Peace was certainly more in favour of the Catholics than of the Protestants. 'Although we are very ready,' he wrote, 'to consider that the evangelical Electors, princes, and Estates were quite entitled to reform and occupy the papal benefices and convents after the conclusion of the Religious Peace, and that it was quite right they should be left in possession, we nevertheless think that to simple minds, unable to rise above the plain letter of the law, the arguments and reasons adduced in justification of such procedure must seem somewhat too feeble.' Electors, princes, and other evangelical Estates would scarcely be able to defend themselves adequately on such grounds, if it should come to a judicial trial. 'The question as to what is to be done with regard to confiscated benefices and convents is clearly decided in the Religious Peace, where it says that all ecclesiastical property which had been confiscated before the Treaty of Passau must be left in the hands of the present possessors. This statement of necessity implies the prohibition of any further reforms or occupation of ecclesiastical property after said Treaty—and it follows, therefore, that those Protestants who have confiscated such property since the conclusion of the Passau Treaty are liable to be

tion so many times confirmed by oath. The protest against the ecclesiastical reservation 'proceeding from but a party and tendered after the sealing and promulgation of the Pacification, and never taken notice of in any subsequent Recess' can be of little value, especially as its foundation is an imperial declaration such as the *clausula derogatoria* (*sic*) of the Act of Pacification does not admit of' (*Archivium*, App. 142–148).

pronounced out of their rights. If this is not the right meaning, we should be glad to know what other straightforward, unperverted interpretation, consonant with justice and with the full scope of the Religious Peace, can be put on words so plain and unequivocal.' [1]

Duke John of Zweibrücken held a different opinion from the Protestant jurists. He would have nothing to do with law-considerations, but said out bluntly that 'civil war in Germany could only be averted by leaving

[1] *Archivium*, pp. 148–150; App. p. 187 ff. Animadverting on the Protestant vindicatory argument that 'If the evangelical Estates were forbidden to reform and confiscate convents, &c., the aim and object of the Religious Peace, viz. *conservatio pacis publicae*, would not be achieved, and unity would not be maintained,' a councillor of the Elector Palatine remarks in a memorandum: 'This argument cuts both ways, and may be retorted *in argumentantem*; for the worst possible quarrelling, discord, and division will arise if priests, monks, &c., are driven out of their convents and deprived of their property by the evangelicals. '*Ita pugnare videtur reformatio et occupatio monasteriorum cum fine et scopo*' of the Religious Peace, '*qui est conservatio pacis et concordiae.*' If the evangelicals should argue in self-defence that 'precedents spoke for them, for they had reformed and confiscated some hundreds of convents also after the conclusion of the Religious Peace, and the Estates themselves had not abstained from such reformation,' the jurist would answer that 'it was not a question of what had been already done, but of *quid fieri debuerit*;' further, 'it is not a question whether the evangelical Estates did or did not carry out the reformation in papal benefices and convents, but whether they did so at any time *ex concessione* of the Religious Peace, and whether they had a legal right to do what they did.' And this right he denied the Protestants on the strength of the plain wording of the Religious Peace (*Archivium*, App. pp. 187–188, 192, 193). Stieve, ii. 520–522, quotes further opinions of contemporary Protestants, who considered the confiscation of clerical property and revenues, after the Treaty of Passau, unjustifiable. That, for instance, of the zealous Protestant jurist, A. Egenolph, in a treatise of 1587. The same writer, in a later discourse of 1602 (in Goldast, *Politica Imperialia*, i. 682 ff.), commits himself indeed to the opposite opinion when he remarks that when the Jesuits found they could not crush out Protestantism either by preaching or by violence, they endeavoured to re-establish the papacy by insisting on the restoration of Church property; and in refutation of their rights can find no better

the Protestant princes, now as before, full power over Catholic benefices and goods.' It was lamentable, he wrote, that the Imperial Chamber should entertain a shadow of doubt as to the right of these princes to confiscate Church property as well after as before the Passau Treaty. Not only must the judgments of this court with regard to the four convents be cancelled, but their authors must be punished 'as an example to others.' If the papists should get their way in this matter, they would at once insist on the restoration of all the convents and benefices that had been confiscated during the last forty years, and they would reintroduce their 'idolatry.' That 'Christian rulers' should tolerate the Catholic worship seemed to him (the Duke) an abominable shame: 'it was impious,' he said, to let part of the people 'get back into the jaws of the devil.' Any attempts at enforcement of these verdicts must be opposed by armed force, and then the papists would experience in Germany also what their co-religionists had experienced during thirty years in the Netherlands and in France. The Protestant Estates must combine together and tell the Emperor plainly that if he did not abolish these popish proceedings in the Imperial Chamber or in his own higher courts of justice, and redress the grievances already petitioned against by the Estates, the latter would grant him no subsidies either against the Turks nor for any other requirements, but that they would use all the means of defence that were left

argument than that the benefices were intended for the service of God and not for that of the devil. An equally zealous Protestant, Zacharias Geizkofler, friend and furtherer of the Count Palatine's interests, said candidly in 1612 that the Religious Peace prohibited any further confiscation of convents and Church property.

them for defending their own 'righteous cause' against the papists.[1]

By denying the Imperial Chamber the right of decision in religious matters—that is to say, in questions of Church property—and insisting that these should all be referred to a diet, the Count Palatine and his party were contemplating wholesale defiance of law and judges with regard to Church goods. For at the Diets they could nullify every single decision through the declaration, only lately reiterated by them, that in questions of religion the decisions of the majority went for nothing.[2]

But more even than against the Imperial Chamber the Count Palatine's party rebelled against the decisions of the Aulic Council (High Court of Justice) which had always worked side by side with the Imperial Chamber.[3]

Formerly the Protestant Estates as well as the Catholics had fully recognised the imperial jurisdiction in all matters, including also affairs of religion. At the Diet of 1566 they had begged the Emperor 'to give your most gracious orders to the highest courts of justice, the Imperial Chamber, and to your Majesty's Aulic Council, that they should conform faithfully to all the articles of the Religious Peace, issuing no decree and sanctioning no procedure which is at variance with

[1] Despatches of Duke John of September 17 to 27, and October 16 to 26, 1600, to the Elector Palatine, and of September 18 to 28 to the deputation at Spires (*Archivium*, App. pp. 82–96, 109–119).

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 528.

[3] 'The Emperor Maximilian and his two successors had continuously carried on their judicial avocations in full compass and unchallenged. In the Treaty of Passau it had only been stipulated that the Aulic Council must be composed of Germans, and the Diet of 1555 had confined itself to reminding the members of this condition' (Herchenhahn, *Gesch. der Entstehung*, &c.; i. 475 ff.).

the said articles, but contrariwise always administering reasonable help, protection, and deliverance to the oppressed and molested party also.' At the Diet of 1570, in their complaints against the Catholics, they had appealed for help to the Aulic Council.[1] In disputes about property also they had often applied to this court; the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse obtained from it on November 9, 1596, a verdict against the Duke of Brunswick.[2]

'Whereas, however, whenever the Religious Peace was concerned, the decisions of the Aulic Council were invariably against the claims of the Protestants, the latter had formed the resolution to wrest from the Emperor the supreme judicial power, with the exception of a few reservations. In 1590 the Protestant Electors, in their petition;[3] in 1597 the Protestant towns; in 1598 at the Ratisbon Diet, the Count Palatine's partisans successively required the Emperor to end the competition of his Aulic Council with the Imperial Chamber; the Palatiners had even made the immediate abolition of lawsuits in the Aulic Council a condition of granting their subsidies.[4]

But the might of Germany had already sunk so low that the imperial judicial power was the only privilege of any worth still left in the hands of the supreme head of the Empire. Rudolf II. was therefore by no means inclined to forego this, and he repudiated decisively the demands made on him.[5]

That 'the Emperor was in his right on this point was the conviction not only of the Catholics, but also

[1] Lehmann, pp. 98, 113; *cf. Archivium*, pp. 88–94.
[2] Senkenberg, xxi. 486.
[3] See above, p. 137.
[4] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 35–36.
[5] Stieve, ii. 531.

of the loyal Lutheran Estates, who were all the less anxious to see the imperial jurisdiction curtailed 'because their own had its source in the Emperor's, being based on imperial fiefdom.' [1]

At the Spires meeting of deputies the Count Palatine's ambassadors complained that the councillors of most of the Protestant Estates still firmly upheld the jurisdiction of the Aulic Council, as equal in standing to the Imperial Chamber. 'With the exception of Brandenburg and Brunswick,' the Palatine councillor Culmann reported, 'nobody was inclined seriously to oppose the proceedings of this tribunal.' Least of all did Frederic William of Saxony and Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg wish to take any part in such action. The former, indeed, remarked that those who were 'now most rabid against the Council had of old appealed to its judgment.' [2]

Meanwhile the cases of the four convents were still hanging in suspense. The Count Palatine could obtain no votes in favour of referring the revisions to the Diet, but parity of revisers was declared by the other Protestant deputies to be an indispensable condition of their revision oaths. Before this point was settled, however, the assembly was adjourned from October 30 to May 1601.

The Count Palatine made good use of this respite in trying to gain fresh opponents both against the Aulic Council and the four convents. The Elector Joachim Frederic of Brandenburg joined him on account of the decisions of the council against his son, the Administrator of Strasburg; Duke Henry Julius

[1] Stieve, ii. 532.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 243–244, 257, note 1; *cf.* Ritter, *Gesch der Union*, i. 219.

of Brunswick did likewise, because the Council had threatened him with the ban for having defied its sentence in his disputes with the town of Brunswick. Lauenburg and Würtemberg also made common cause with the Count Palatine because they had grudges against this imperial court. Duke Frederic of Würtemberg, on October 24, 1595, had caused the monastery of Reichenbach to be surprised by a body of one hundred infantry and cavalry; the prior had been driven to flight, the novices carried off, the monks forced to accept a Protestant steward, and the subjects of the monastery compelled to do homage.[1] The Aulic Council had insisted on restoration of the old condition of things. But Frederic had insolently defied this enactment, and also a second one which the Countess of Eberstein had procured against him in 1599 because of his having forcibly installed a preacher, in place of the Catholic pastor, in the hamlets of Boltringen and Obertorf, the jurisdiction of which he shared with her.[2] All the above Estates had, so they said, 'excellent and righteous grounds' for contesting the authority of that 'most objectionable imperial tribunal.'

Already at Spires, at the beginning of November 1600, the confederates who had pledged themselves to common action in the matter had declared that 'the tyrannical proceedings of this court were the fount and origin of all the oppressive measures hitherto enacted in the Empire against the evangelicals,' and moreover it was 'an unfailing means for bringing these Estates—aye, and the whole Roman Empire of the German nation—to a state of slavery.'[3]

[1] [Besold], *Virg. sacr. Monim.* pp. 272–275.
[2] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 219; Stieve, ii. 533–534
[3] In the *Archivium*, App. p. 123.

This, however, could not be tolerated. Accordingly, the Count Palatine, the Elector of Brandenburg, Brunswick, Lauenburg, Zweibrücken, Ansbach, Baden, the Protestant Administrator of Strasburg, the Protestant Bishop of Osnabrück, and the Counts of Öttingen and of the Wetterau, sent their ambassadors to a conclave at Friedberg. There, on February 12, 1601, it was resolved to inform the Emperor, briefly and by means of a deputation, that the Estates were determined not to submit to the decisions of the court tribunal, and that they would not consent to their enforcement. The Aulic Council's power of decision must be limited to quarrels about imperial feofs; in case of a breach of the public peace, it must be left open to the complainant to appeal either to this court or to the Imperial Chamber.

The confederates at once began to prepare for using armed force. But on this occasion—so it is stated in the Recess of the meeting—'the confederates could not come to a decision as to how much money or how many men each Estate should hasten to send to any other in case of its being oppressed, because 'some of the delegates had not received sufficient instructions.' On the whole, however, it was agreed that all the Estates should stand by each other firmly, inseparably, and undauntedly like *one* man, and that 'each lord in his own domain should hold himself well in readiness,' and, in order to be equipped in case of need, 'should call his subjects out to arms.' With regard to the dispute concerning the four convents, it was unanimously agreed that all the delegates must join in lodging an appeal against the revision of the verdicts, and that if they failed in their object

at Spires, they must withdraw altogether from the business of revision.[1]

In a private despatch to the Count Palatine, March 13, the Elector Joachim Frederic of Brandenburg expressed the fear that, if measures of this sort were taken against the proceedings of the Aulic Council, the Empire would become a prey to schism. It was not justifiable to threaten the Emperor with such extreme measures; he recommended, therefore, that the idea of sending a written address to his Majesty should be given up until a larger number of the Estates should have come to agreement; he himself could not consent to the embassy proposed.[2] All the same he ordered his ambassador to Prague.

On June 8 Rudolf II. gave the princes' ambassadors a most gracious reception, and promised to see that each of their grievances was thoroughly sifted, and judgment afterwards pronounced. The Protestant Burkhard von Berlichingen, one of the most influential of the imperial councillors, told one of the delegates in confidence that 'Rudolf would be very easily induced to fill both the Aulic Council and his own Privy Council half with Protestants, if the Protestant princes at the next Diet pressed the matter in good earnest.'[3]

[1] Recess and Supplementary Recess of the Diet at Friedberg, February 12, 1601, in the *Archivium*, App. pp. 148–171; Protocol of the Convent, in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 259–267; *Beschwerdeschrift an den Kaiser*, February 28, pp. 271–272; *cf.* Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 220–228.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 272–273.

[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 282, note 6. In company with Berlichingen, the former Brandenburg Chancellor Merkbach and the Saxon agent, Dr. Gödelmann, shared the confidence of the Emperor. In a written document of the Archdukes Matthias, Maximilian, and Ferdinand, it says: 'Besides which your Majesty held most intimate intercourse and relations with the wicked Calvinistic man Merkbach, formerly Chancellor of Brandenburg, with von Perlingen, with Dr. Gedlmann and other

Before the imperial answer was given the die had been cast at the second assembly of deputies at Spires. On July 15 the delegates of the Count Palatine, of the Elector of Brandenburg and of the Duke of Brunswick, stated the agreement which they had formulated at Friedberg: namely, that, 'In the cases of the four convents, and any more of the kind that might occur, they could not consent to revision by the Imperial Chamber; all such matters must be referred to the Emperor and to the Estates respectively, otherwise they should dissociate themselves entirely from the whole business of revision, and should regard anything which the deputies presumed to do in the matter as null, invalid, and worthless. For the Imperial Chamber, by means of this question of the four convents, was smoothing the way, not only for a reaction against the reforms already carried out, but also for depriving those Estates who went over to the evangelical religion of all future right of reformation. They declared in threatening language that if perchance the other deputies decided otherwise, their lords would 'oppose them with all means permitted by nature and by law, and if damage and disturbance should result from their action, they should hold none others to blame but those contumacious persons who, in matters of religion, had gone further than their rights.' [1]

Thus the Catholics were to consent to have all their

Calvinists and sectarians, and with all sorts of the very worst and lowest people; so that you communicate your council's intentions and negotiations to them; you write them letters with your own hand, and often allow them to attend your person; nay, often, being disheartened through these sectarians, you have intended to ride off and leave all your lands' (Stieve, *Verhandl. über die Nachfolge*, p. 141, cf. 79).

[1] *Archivium*, App. pp. 179–182.

legal claims referred from the courts of justice to the Diets, where the Estates were all at variance with each other, and where, moreover, the Count Palatine's party would not recognise any decision by a majority. They were at the same time to throw doors and gates wide open to the Protestants for further violent raids on Church property; for the latter, on their own showing, had no intention of being satisfied with the triumphs they had already gained.

The opposition of the Catholics to such a decision of the three princes was therefore only natural.

But the majority of the Protestant deputies also would not agree to it without further deliberation. They insisted that the demands of the princes should at least be deferred until, in the settlement of the whole thirty-seven cases of revision, the turns of the four convents should come in due course. This suggestion was put forward in the form of a resolution by the Protestants and Catholics. The ambassadors of the three princes opposed the measure, and the Count Palatine's party announced that 'they might all now go home as soon as they liked.' The deputies who remained on accordingly agreed at the end of July to adjourn the meeting, in the hope that the Emperor would find some means to persuade the dissentient Estates to agree to the revisions.[1]

Imperial justice lay prostrate. The meeting of deputies had been dissolved; the whole efficacy of the Imperial Chamber was maimed, and godless anarchy was close at hand.[2]

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 230–233; Senkenberg, xxii. 20–22; Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 542–546.

[2] Stieve, ii. 546–547.

Frederic William of Saxony wrote on September 25, 1601, to the Palatine Elector that all the revisions had come to a standstill, and that the meeting had broken up without anything having been accomplished. Such goings on, he said, would have the effect either of upsetting the whole framework of justice and all the ordinary machinery of government whereby the Estates of both religions were kept together, or of producing even worse dissension and separation than already prevailed, and landing the Fatherland in irremediable disaster. He begged the Elector to consider calmly and intelligently what dangers and distresses might arise if the sentences of the Imperial Chamber were no longer enforced, if the Emperor's prestige and dignity were completely ruined, and if deeds of mutual violence were enacted between the Estates of the Empire.[1]

The proceedings at Spires exercised an important influence on the decision which was communicated to the Protestant ambassadors on August 20 respecting the lawsuits before the Aulic Council. To his great

[1] *Archivium*, App. pp. 183–186. Caspar Schoppe said that the Estates bent on the overthrow of the constitution of the Empire 'took as rule and direction for their actions not the true and imperial law but their own opinions, wishes, and pleasure. If they are complained of to the Emperor they say that the Emperor has no power and jurisdiction over them as imperial Estates, except in two respects, namely, *in causis turbatae pacis publicae et in feudis illustrium*, and even in these cases they will not allow the Emperor to be absolute judge, unless he takes into his counsel a certain number of impartial princes—that is to say, princes who hold the same views as they do. If they are accused before the Imperial Chamber they demand revision; if revision is instituted they deny the Imperial Chamber any more authority in the matter, and say either that it is a matter of religion, or else that the court is prejudiced. If the case is then brought before the Estates assembled in Diet, they refuse to be bound by any imperial Recess, and say judgment should be given according to what the *saniora*, not what the *majora vota* settle and conclude. And that their own *vota* are *saniora*, they would bring the others by violence to believe' (Friedberg, *Newer Calvinistischer Modell*, p. 104).

grief and mortification the princes pronounced the Emperor deprived of his judicial authority, notwithstanding that their own judicial powers were derived from his, and could not exist independently. The Emperor (so the statement went on) had not the power to renounce what was his by right; he intended to examine the individual grievances, and whenever he found that they were well-grounded, he would redress them; in return for this he expected the Estates not to thwart the lawful authority of his council, and not to compel him to resort to the prescribed measures for punishing such insubordination.[1]

Leonard Schug, one of the delegates of the Count Palatine, gave it as his opinion that it was the rejection of the revisions at Spires which had provoked this positive refusal from the Emperor at Prague. 'Now, say the imperial councillors, the higher Estates can no longer be restrained by law; if the Emperor also surrendered to them the jurisdiction of the Aulic Council, imperial justice would be annihilated.'[2]

On August 26 the ambassadors entered a protest against the imperial decision; their lords, they said, would not submit to the proceedings of the imperial court as they had hitherto been conducted.

Leonard Schug had also signed this declaration, but he felt in conscience bound to confess to the Vice-chancellor of the Count Palatine that he thought the behaviour of the princes was 'in truth too derogatory to the Emperor.' The affair had been understood at Prague 'as if certain of the Estates of the Empire had made it their special business to overrule the Emperor in all his actions.' Now it is the general

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 294–295. [2] Ritter, i. 296, note 1.

opinion that this overruling is instigated by the councillors of Heidelberg. All the plans are first concocted there, and then put into the heads of others.' 'By this business of the revision of the verdicts respecting the four convents, the councillors have brought great odium on themselves, and it is nevertheless to be feared that the sentences will not be altered, for we true-hearted evangelicals are fain to say with the papists: we are in the wrong and we have conjured up ideas which are mere empty shadows.'

Schug was not in very good spirits. In the Palatinate, he said, the electoral treasuries were exhausted, and the property sold; and the ten yearly taxes imposed on the subjects 'not in the least used for the purposes intended.' On account of these taxes 'a disagreeable time was at hand.'

'The subjects who had all along paid up so grudgingly would not be silent about this state of things, especially if they were burdened with a fresh impost, or if any other disturbance arose in the country, which was not improbable.' Whereas freedom of speech was not 'in place' at the electoral court, he, Schug, feared that he might 'some day, for some unguarded word, be put out of the door.' He would rather, he said, defend the cause of a peasant, or accept a humble office in the imperial tribunal, than risk great danger in furtherance of a policy which moreover was detrimental to the Fatherland.[1]

[1] 'Schreiben vom November 16, 26, 1601,' in the *Archivium*, App. pp. 201-205.

CHAPTER XV

THE TURKISH DANGER AND PALATINE POLICY—NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING THE SUCCESSION IN THE EMPIRE—HESSIAN NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANKFORT IN THE YEAR 1602

WHILE the anarchical condition of the Empire went on steadily increasing, the Turkish danger also had become more and more serious. On October 20, 1600, Kaniza, the bulwark of Styria and Vienna, had fallen into the hands of the Ottomans. The Pope and the whole of Christendom bewailed this heavy blow, while in Constantinople a four days' festival of triumph was celebrated.[1] At the beginning of April 1601 Sigmund Bathori, after the expulsion of the imperial governor, had received homage in Transylvania as prince of the land and had negotiated a reconciliation with the Turks.[2] In the Christian army discord and enmity prevailed between the German soldiers and the Italians who had entered the imperial service, and this enmity was the chief obstacle in the way of lasting military successes.[3] Rudolf urgently implored the Estates for help. The ecclesiastical princes of the Upper Rhine circle promised double the sum previously voted;[4] the Administrator of Saxony contributed substantial

[1] See Huber, iv. 406 ff., and Stauffer in the *Mitteil. des Österreich. Instituts*, vii. (1886), 265 ff.

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 560–561.

[3] Fuller and new information in Stauffer, p. 75 ff. [4] Hurter, iv. 365.

supplies of money and materials of war.[1] The Elector Palatine, on the contrary, though Rudolf had sent him two embassies within one year and three despatches beseeching him 'in mercy' and 'quite supplicatingly' to pay up his contribution, would not send anything;[2] and yet all the time he was supporting the States-General with very considerable sums of money and was urging other Protestant Estates to do the same.[3]

The idea was to use the Turkish danger as a tool for denuding the Emperor of the last remnants of his power. Michael Lösenius, one of the Count Palatine's court jurists, said once in a memorandum for Frederic IV. that 'an Estate of the Empire suffering oppression from the Emperor, either lawfully or unlawfully, could appeal to the Elector of the Palatinate: in cases of appeal and in simple cases of prosecution the latter possessed judicial power superior to that of the Emperor. Frederic ought to bring this power back into force in order to put an end to the evangelical grievances.'[4]

In the middle of January 1602 the Count Palatine proposed to the members of his party to arrange for another meeting of deputies at Friedberg. At the instigation, he said, of the papal nuncio and the Spanish ambassador the Emperor was setting about 'to make his dominion an absolute one;' it was necessary therefore to consider 'what could be done by the opposite party for the maintenance of German liberty.' They must consider, in the first place, whether they should appeal from the Emperor ill-advised to the same better advised

[1] Stieve, ii. 564–565. [2] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 234–235.

[3] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 266; *Briefe und Akten*, i. 304, No. 239.

[4] *Gutachten vom 2 Januar 1603* (cf. Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 351, No. 278) in Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 21–22; cf. *Nachtrab Anhaltischer Cantzley Bl.* C. 2; and Friedberg, *Newer Calvinistischer Modell*, pp. 63–64.

and to the Estates of the Empire. They must also decide first, what attitude they should assume towards the attempt to enforce the verdicts of the Aulic Council; secondly, what to do in the matter of the four convents; thirdly, what was to be said to the Emperor respecting the refusal of Turkish subsidies; and, finally, how they were to obtain from him redress of the evangelical grievances concerning which they had already addressed a petition to him.[1] Duke John of Zweibrücken, in his answer to the Elector's proposal on February 9, said that 'not the councillors only but also the princes ought to meet at Friedberg. As for the course to be pursued with regard to the proceedings of the Aulic Council, they had a model in the behaviour of their Dutch and French co-religionists, and in that of their own ancestors. 'The grievances' would never be redressed until 'they extorted a decision on the matter by force of arms;' nor could the 'explanation' of the Religious Peace desired by the Protestants be obtained by any other means than force.[2]

On March 20 the representatives of the Palatinate, of Brandenburg, of Zweibrücken, Ansbach, Brunswick, Lauenburg, Baden-Durlach, and a few other Estates began their transactions at Friedberg. But the meeting by no means realised the wishes of the Palatine party. They moved a resolution to the effect that it should be allowed to appeal from the imperial judicial pronouncements to the decision of the Estates, and also that the authority of the Aulic Council should be superseded in the two cases which they had reserved to this

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 301–302. See Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, p. 235–237.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 305.

court only the year before (1601): namely, judgments on imperial fiefs and on violation of the public peace. The majority of the members, however, felt scruples in consenting to these proposals. The Palatine scheme for the formation of a union also fell through. The only point on which agreement was arrived at was the renewed resolution to persevere in opposing the verdicts on the four convents and in holding back the Turkish subsidies.[1]

To the distress of the Heidelbergers the Elector of Brandenburg gradually withdrew from their tactics. When the Imperial Chamber announced in May 1602 that all who did not pay up the Turkish subsidies voted in 1598 within four months would fall under sentence of the imperial ban, Joachim Frederic at any rate paid the forty Roman months which the Protestant Estates had promised at the time. 'The danger in Hungary,' he wrote to Frederic IV. on June 19, 'grows daily greater; we cannot altogether forsake the Emperor in his and the Fatherland's extremity.'[2]

The foreign intrigues also of the revolutionary party were not consonant with the views of the Elector. As Administrator of Magdeburg he had formerly most urgently recommended an alliance with France,[3] but in the year 1600 he informed the Margrave of Ansbach that 'as Elector he was especially pledged to the Emperor, and it seemed to him that he should

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 312–319; Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 238–239; Stieve, ii. 575–577.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 322. The Duke of Brunswick also sought to draw nearer to the Emperor, and showed himself ready to hand him over a fixed sum 'voluntarily' in place of the arrears of Turkish subsidies (Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 327, No. 256).

[3] See above, p. 135, 136.

be placing himself in a highly compromising position by associating himself with France in transactions concerning affairs of the Empire.' [1]

When the Archduke Maximilian called on him in February 1601 to oppose the French intrigues regarding the succession in the Empire, he promised him that at the next election of a King he would not pass over the House of Austria without great and important reasons.[2]

For many years past the bachelor and sickly Emperor had been repeatedly reminded by his mother and brothers, by the papal and the Spanish courts, by the ecclesiastical Electors and by the Duke of Bavaria, that, in view of the perilous position of the Empire and his imperial House, he ought to make timely provision for a successor. But all suggestions and remonstrances had been in vain.[3] Rudolf lived

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 222, note 1.

[2] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 255–256.

[3] Fuller details in Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, p. 3 ff. Concerning Duke William of Bavaria's intentions of obtaining the imperial dignity for his own house, see p. 70. See also now Stieve's article, based on hitherto unknown documents of the State Archives at Munich, entitled 'Herzog Maximilian und die Kaiser-krone,' in Quidde's *Zeitschr. für Geschichtswissenschaft* vi. (1891), p. 40 ff. See also *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, Abt. 5, p. 54 ff., and the careful and valuable works of Zöchbaur, already often quoted by us. One day when Duke Maximilian was having a conversation with the Emperor at the Diet of 1594, and endeavouring to convince him of the groundlessness of the suspicion that Bavaria was struggling for the crown, the imperial chamberlain Hans Popp, 'the apple of Rudolf's eye,' broke out in all manner of imprecations against the attendants in the Duke's suite, and roared out: 'The jesuitical vermin is at it again, libelling and slandering this man and that; they are plotting to turn the pious Emperor and the House of Austria off the throne, and to get it into their own house, the wicked jesuitical villains' (v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 500–503; see Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 421–422). Once when the Elector Augustus of Saxony offered the imperial crown to Duke Albrecht V., the latter answered: 'I would rather remain Duke of Bavaria than become your fool' (Stieve, *Verhandlungen*, p. 85).

in constant apprehension that there was a conspiracy amongst his own brothers 'for wresting the sceptre from him.' As time went on he withdrew more and more from all affairs of State, 'kept as far as possible aloof from people, and devoted himself to curios and works of art,' whereby, writes Klevenhüller, 'he lapsed into such a state of melancholy, that he was often quite eccentric in his behaviour.' [1] He fell a victim to a mental illness,[2] which it was feared might end

[1] Hurter, v. 70 ff. When Rudolf II. succeeded to the throne he had the firm intention of keeping the affairs of state in his own hands; he was not wanting in capacity to do this, even though at first he showed but slight familiarity with the business of government. But his predilection for art and learning and his natural indecision of character caused public documents to accumulate, and the more they accumulated the more they deterred him from putting his hand to the work. Irregular living also aggravated the irritability of his nerves and the melancholy disposition which he had in part inherited (Zöchbaur, i. 11, 14 ff.).

[2] Evidence has of late been brought forward showing the similarity of Rudolf's illness to that of King Louis II. of Bavaria. Stieve, who draws the comparison, remarks: 'This disease did not impair the patient's thinking powers, and it never reduced him to the point of intellectual incapacity for government; but it was undoubtedly the cause of the frenzies which so often took possession of him, and also, in the last years of his life, of the many insane plans he conceived. From the outset also this malady paralysed his will, made it more and more difficult for him to rouse himself to act and to form decisions, and filled him in increasing measure with nervous melancholia, with fear of persecution, and with delusions of grandeur. . . . The symptoms were observed to make rapid progress after the disgraceful issue, in 1588, of Archduke Maximilian's candidature for the Polish crown. In the autumn of 1598 the disease reached its climax. Rudolf became less accessible to the public than ever before, and more and more seldom forsook his apartments and his private haunts. It was only in the stables, and dressed like the grooms, that strangers could get a glimpse of him. In 1609 the Bohemian Estates actually doubted whether he were still alive' (*Allgem. deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1889), xxix. 496–497). Turba, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Habsburger* (Vienna, 1899), p. 48, inserts a medical opinion of Dr. Hirschl, according to which 'no mental aberration belonging to any of the usual categories of mental disease is demonstrable in Rudolf.' The *Böhmische Landtagsverhandlungen*, Bd. 10 (Prague, 1900), those of 1600 especially, contain several documents relating to the different stages of Rudolf's illness,

in complete insanity, or possibly in death, and then the Empire would be exposed to all the danger and turmoil of an interregnum.

This, however, was precisely what the Palatine party, who were closely informed as to the Emperor's condition, had in view.[1] They strove, accordingly, to restrain him from consenting to the election of a successor. In February 1601, at the very time when they were setting every lever in action against Rudolf, the Palatine party instructed Christian of Anhalt to inform him that 'the Elector Frederic was deeply grieved at the report that there was an idea of restricting the Emperor in his government by the election of a King of the Romans; he, the Emperor, had now reached the best years of his life, and, armed with all the experience he had gained, added to the high intelligence he possessed, he was now qualified to the full for the office of government. He was far better adapted for undivided than for divided rule. He must not let himself be used as the tool of those false counsellors who were aiming, not at maintaining his and the Empire's dignity, but, on the contrary, at making life and government more difficult to him.'[2] Chief among such were the Pope and the King of Spain, who insisted on the nomination of a successor in the Empire.

In the preceding year, 1600, it so happened that the Emperor had been seized by occasional outbursts of rage, under the influence of which he had flown

and to the transactions for securing the succession to the throne. Page 95 deals with an attempt at suicide by the Emperor (see Loserth in the *Histor. Zeitschr.* 87, p. 377).

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 247–250.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 258–259; Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 253.

at the people round about him and had inflicted injuries on them; he had even wanted repeatedly to put an end to himself. During these fits of rage he had poured out abuse against the Catholic religion, and had invoked the devil. Rudolf—so the Archduke Matthias wrote on October 16, 1600—tormented himself with the thought that there was a desire to depose him from the throne and to put an end to him; he had discharged his councillors, and could neither eat nor sleep; he imagined himself poisoned, bewitched.[1] The

[1] Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, pp. 45 ff., 128 ff., 140; cf. Hurter, v. 74–75. Towards the Jesuits the Emperor showed his dislike as early as 1593; he accused the Capuchins of Prague of having bewitched him in 1600, and he used to set off raving whenever he heard their bells ringing for prayer in their monastery near the castle. Tycho de Brahe, he said, had predicted from the stars that he would be murdered by a Capuchin. Stieve, *Verhandlungen*, p. 58; cf. Zöchbaur, ii. 27; J. Fischer in *Der sogen. Schottwiener Vertrag vom Jahre 1600* (*Fribourg Suisse*, 1898) gives (5) from a letter of Unverzagt to Archduke Ferdinand, dated Prague, 1600, October 19 (which letter is in the Innsbruck Archives), the following particulars related by an eye-witness concerning Rudolf's state: 'The Capuchins cannot be at all endured; their prayers are looked upon as witchcraft. The Mass also is much inveighed against. He (the Emperor) actually feels through his clothes if any one wears a crucifix or a relic from his neck. On Sunday last he wanted to take his own life. His delusion that he is being persecuted is as evident as daylight. Day and night he is tortured with the idea that he is forsaken, that no one is faithful to him, that he has lost all respect, that people are plotting to take his life and his throne, that he is being poisoned, the food he takes made to turn on his stomach, his face burnt, his hands tied, that he is obliged to do what others will, that he is bewitched.' Rudolf laid the blame of his bewitchment on the Capuchins, who had a convent in the neighbourhood of the imperial castle, and he demanded their expulsion of the Archbishop of Prague. On the latter's refusing to comply with this order, Rudolf wanted to banish the Archbishop from Prague, and it was only through the remonstrances of Unverzagt that he was allowed to remain. Unverzagt sums up his view of the condition of Rudolf, who 'would become metamorphosed four times in one hour,' in the concluding sentence: 'it is manifestly the work of the evil one.' According to the careful investigations of Fischer, moreover, the so-called *Schottwiener Vertrag* is nothing more than a draft which the Archduke Matthias brought with him to Schottwien after his interview with Ferdinand, where these

Archdukes Matthias, Maximilian, and Ferdinand feared that the crown might be played into the hands of the French or the Danish King by the Protestant princes. Matthias begged the Administrator of Saxony to take precautionary measures on behalf of the Empire. 'Strange and wicked intrigues,' wrote Melchior Klesl, 'are on foot in the Empire between some of the Protestant Electors and princes and France and Denmark. In the kingdoms also and in Austria there are people who are delighted to promote such schemes against the House of Habsburg, in order that this House may be deprived of the succession, or that its power may be hedged in, or that it may be involved in other dangerous and prejudicial complications.' [1]

Henry IV. of France, who had long coveted the throne, had spoken in June 1599 concerning the possibility of his being elected.[2] In February 1600, on the other hand, he instructed his ambassador Bongars to assure the Protestant princes that he had never aspired to the dignity of King of the Romans. It was the King of Spain who was the most eager for this honour; but the princes must prevent his election, and also that of the Archduke Albert; possibly they might be able to set up a candidate from some other German princely house.[3] Ancel, the French resident at the

two were quite alone, and where they agreed to join the attempt first planned by the widowed Archduchess Maria, to induce the Elector of Cologne to take a journey to Prague in order to have speech with the Emperor; the Elector, however, declined to do this. The idea of any interview and conference of the three Archdukes Matthias, Maximilian, and Ferdinand at Schottwien can no longer be entertained.

[1] Hurter, v. 71, 75, 407; cf. Stieve, *Verhandl. über die Nachfolge*, p. 29, note 79.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 236, note to No. 138; cf. Stieve, *Verhandl. über die Nachfolge*, p. 73.

[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 235, note to No. 138.

Court of Prague, by Henry IV.'s orders, represented to the Emperor that 'the elevation to the Kingship of the Romans would inevitably raise his Majesty to dominion over all Europe—that is to say, over the whole world:' for the present, however, there was little prospect of such an event, as none of the Electors were favourable to him. But he pointed out the means whereby the difficulties might be removed. Chief among these means was the prevention of Archduke Matthias's election. It was his opinion that there could be no more skilful line of policy than to work upon the Emperor not to make any decision concerning the election 'in order that after his death the game might be all the finer.' [1]

In order to accomplish his double aim with the Protestant princes—the eviction of the Habsburgers from the imperial throne, and the support of the States-General against Spain—Henry IV. endeavoured to bring about a close union of these princes with France.

His most zealous helper in the promotion of this plan was the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Cassel. Without disclosing his intention to anyone, he went to France in the autumn of 1602 and communicated his views to the Secretary of State, Villeroy, and to the King. In a conversation with the former he urged that as a first step Henry should refund the money which the Protestant princes had either advanced to him or spent in his interests. 'I said that our affection for the King was in no slight degree lessened by the fact that he was now paying money to England, to the States, and to Switzerland, that he coquetted with these countries and

[1] '. . . afin qu'après son decez le jeu en soit d'autant plus beau' (Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 298-300).

treated them with great respect, while he left us to beg, beseech, and implore, and gave us finally nothing but good words.' Villeroy listened 'with a smile of patience.' When Moritz said emphatically that if the princes did not get any money from France, they would, though most unwillingly, attach themselves to Austria, Villeroy answered: 'He could say nothing more in excuse of the King but that his councillors did not willingly part with money.' 'Thereupon,' the Landgrave continues, 'I spoke out freely and said, "Just you manage that the King desists from his building operations for some years and gives us the money he would have spent in this way, and we will build him up a palace which will enable him to carry out his intentions, and to extend his kingdom and his name."' During this conversation the King came up, led Moritz aside, and said '"he hoped that the German princes had formed a satisfactory union." I answered that this had not yet been accomplished, but I had good hope that, if his Majesty would allow us to make him the foundation of such union, all would then be well. The King said we might do that; he would not forsake us provided we could agree among ourselves. He then asked the names of those who were willing to join this union. I told him that we could reckon confidently on the Palatinate, on Brandenburg, Brunswick, Hesse, Baden, Anhalt, together with the Counts of Wetterau; and that we had good hopes of Holstein, Denmark, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania, but that Saxony and Würtemberg had not yet shown any inclination to join. Thereupon Henry remarked that he had had no idea that there were so many in favour of the union, asked for further details, and wanted to know the qualifications of each individual house and

prince, their revenues and natural resources. I gave him as much information as it was necessary for him to have.'

Concerning the election of a successor in the Empire, the Landgrave had already told Villeroy that 'he had positive intelligence that at the imperial court hopes were fixed on the Archduke Albert, that he was preferred before the Archdukes Matthias and Maximilian. The German princes, however, could easily see that, if they persisted in retaining the House of Austria, they would not lightly emerge from their difficulties, but would plunge into deeper and deeper ones every day.' He assured the King that 'the Elector of Cologne was in favour of Albert's election, and was endeavouring also to draw the other ecclesiastical Electors to his side, and it was very important for his Majesty to hinder this.' Some of the princes were not ill-disposed to his Majesty. At first, however, Henry denied that he had any such ambition; it was not till a later interview that he came round 'somewhat nearer' to the Landgrave's views. Moritz advised him to send an embassy to all the Electors, in order 'to dissuade them from an Austrian election.' Henry promised to support the German princes in everything, as soon as they had banded themselves together. He declared at the same time, with fervent protestation, that 'he was still devoted to the reformed religion, and intended before his death to confess to it openly.' On the King's asking 'if the House of Bavaria were not also to be won over, if it was in competition with Austria, and aspired also to the imperial throne,' Moritz answered 'that Bavaria did aspire to the throne he considered certain, but as for winning her over, the Protestant princes must not attempt it; France must manage this.'

Henry did not yet dare to come forward himself as a candidate for the throne. He preferred rather to work for Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, whose election would kindle bitter enmity between the Houses of Habsburg and Wittelsbach, would still further weaken the power of the Empire and the Catholics, and would strengthen the cause of the Protestants. He charged the Landgrave to bestir himself actively with the Protestant Electors on behalf of Maximilian, and promised 'to help him in the matter, and to do the utmost he could.' The German prince, who regarded the King of the French as arbiter in German affairs, wrote to an ambassador of the Elector Palatine, that 'Henry's view of the matter, which he cannot be induced to alter,' is that 'the imperial dignity must be transferred to the House of Bavaria, which is friendly to the Palatinate.' The King wished the contemplated league to be formed as soon as possible.[1]

Before Moritz, who was delighted with the result of his journey, returned to Germany, another special favour fell to his share. King Henry, on October 20, 1602, caused a document to be drafted nominating the Landgrave General-in-chief of all the German troops which should enter the service of France; a yearly income of 36,000 livres was guaranteed him, in times both of peace and of war.[2] Moritz had been anxious for the post of general-in-chief, the King wrote to Bongars on October 27, and he had conferred it on him in order to enlist him in his service. Moreover, the Landgrave

[1] 'Eigene Aufzeichnungen des Landgrafen über seine Verhandlungen, in Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 459–467; also Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 278, note 2.

[2] Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 266.

had promised faithfully and conscientiously to further all the royal interests in Germany. Since the Protestant Union was so essential to France, he had spurred on the Landgrave to get it concluded, and had assured him that he would support his German friends—especially the Elector Palatine and the Margrave of Ansbach—with all his might.[1]

The first thing to be done was to prevent the Protestant Administrator of the bishopric of Strasburg from being completely ousted by the Catholic Bishop, Cardinal Charles of Lorraine.[2]

Henry had promised the Landgrave that he would support the Administrator if the German princes would take up his case in earnest: they might also get help from the States-General. 'The whole gist of the Strasburg business,' wrote Prince Christian of Anhalt, 'lies in the fact that the evangelical Estates have as much right to the bishoprics as the Catholic Estates.'[3]

On December 5, 1602, Moritz urged the Elector Palatine to get the other Protestant princes to come to a resolute decision. They must, he said, declare at the forthcoming Diet that until the Strasburg question was settled conformably to the claims of the Protestants, 'they neither could nor would vote or pay any contributions, disputed or non-disputed, notwithstanding any extremity of Turkish danger, old or new.' The princes must finally decide on the long-wished-for Union, must make their decision known to the King of France, enter into negotiations with the States-General, solicit help from England and Scotland with perfect secrecy, and also draw Denmark to their side. If it

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 330–334. [2] See above, pp. 181-182.
[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 339, note 2.

should come to war on account of the bishopric of Strasburg, care must be taken to obtain the military forces of the States-General, and to get possession of the French frontier strongholds: the war must not be waged in the bishopric, but must be transferred to Lorraine.[1]

But Henry IV. did not act in the Strasburg affair according to the promise which he had made to the Landgrave. He sought to come to an understanding with Lorraine for his own advantage,[2] and thus again in this instance made good what the Duke of Würtemberg wrote about the French on January 7, 1603: 'They are more fickle and inconstant than the wind.' 'But,' he added, 'if others make any promises to them, they insist on their being kept strictly and honourably.'[3]

In February 1603 fresh transactions concerning the Union took place at Heidelberg. This attempt, however, was also a failure, chiefly for the reason that jealousy and mistrust reigned between the Palatiners and the Landgrave Moritz.[4] The relations between the Elector Frederic IV. and Henry IV. of France had been of a strained nature ever since the former had espoused the cause of his son-in-law, the Duke of Bouillon, who had formed a conspiracy against the King.[5]

Frederic informed the Emperor, through Christian of Anhalt, that he was ignorant of what had been transacted in France with regard to the Strasburg affair: it was very possible that the principal French leaders had an eye on Alsace and on the Empire.[6]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 337–341.
[2] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 281 ff.
[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 351, No. 279.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 360–365.
[5] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 7–16.
[6] 'Instruktion Friedrichs IV. für Christian,' March 8, 1603, in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 377–378.

The Elector had at that time a special reason for bestowing gracious words on the Emperor. In consequence of his dissipated life, Frederic was constantly in bad health, and was likely to die at an early age. His son was only six years old, and there was every chance of a minority during which, according to the Golden Bull and to tradition, the Count Palatine Philip Louis of Neuburg, the eldest male relative of the Elector, would be guardian. But Philip Louis was a rigid Lutheran, and it was apprehended that as guardian he would exercise the same influence on behalf of his own religion as John Casimir had formerly done for his. Just as the latter had compelled his Lutheran ward, together with the whole electorate, to adopt Calvinism, so, under the tutelage of Philip Louis, the reverse might easily happen, and Lutheranism be reintroduced. In order to prevent such a contingency, Frederic, in a will of December 1602, had appointed other guardians, and endeavoured to obtain the Emperor's confirmation of this will. He had offered Rudolf a considerable body of troops instead of the outstanding Turkish soldiers, and had promised, at the forthcoming Diet at Ratisbon, to support the imperial measures of taxation.[1] But, 'as usual, it was a case of throwing words to the wind.'

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 17 ff.; Stieve, ii. 580 ff.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

CHAPTER XVI

THE RATISBON DIET OF 1603—THE SUCCESS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

THE Ratisbon Diet, opened in March 1603 by the Archduke Matthias as representative of the Emperor, resulted, like all the earlier ones, in still further heightening the discords in the Empire. For although the Estates voted the Emperor the very substantial help of eighty-six Roman months, to be paid in three years, the Count Palatine and his party, the so-called 'corresponding Estates,' again managed to keep a door of retreat open by coupling their consent with the condition that their grievances must first be redressed, and that the obligation to pay the subsidies should lapse, as soon, and for as long a period, as the peace of the Empire was disturbed.

'The Estates were again mutually opposed in the sternest conflict, and the dissolution of the Diet seemed imminent,' when the regulation of the judicial system came on for discussion. The Emperor's instructions were to the effect that 'the stagnation which had gone on since the dissolution of the assembly of deputies at Spires must cease, and the cases of revision be once more resumed': the number of these had risen to nearly one hundred. The question of the four cloisters, now as before, was the chief source of acrimony among the members. The ambassadors of the Count Palatine and

of the Elector of Brandenburg signified at the council of Electors that 'their lords would not undertake the business of the revisions until the adjournment of the four cloister cases and all similar suits had been unconditionally guaranteed.' At the instigation of the Count Palatine, the ambassadors of Brunswick, Hesse, and Pomerania declared that 'These cases must be in such wise kept distinct from all the others, that nevermore in the future would it be possible to bring similar cases before the Imperial Chamber, nor to subject them to revision.' 'The papists must give them and the other evangelical Estates satisfactory surety on this point,' and they must, during this Diet, declare that to all Estates who have already gone over to the evangelical religion, or who shall do so in future, 'it shall be allowed not only to alter religious doctrine in general, but also to reform the convents in the territories of every individual Estate': that is to say, to take possession of these convents in spite of the Religious Pacification of Augsburg. If this declaration were not made, they (Brunswick, Hesse, and Pomerania) could not consent to the political revisions, and would take no further part in the transactions of the Diet.[1]

The ambassadors of Pfalz-Neuburg had been instructed 'at the beginning' to insist on the adjournment of the four convent cases, but not to 'leave the council board in a huff,' for 'such behaviour would have the appearance of sedition, and would be no slight insult to his Majesty, besides which it would detract greatly from the dignity of the Roman Empire.' [2]

[1] According to the report of the ambassadors of Pfalz-Neuburg; Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 395-396; cf. Stieve, ii. 656, note 2.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 397. The Protestant town delegates agreed unanimously to vote for the adjournment of the four convent

The Palatine party wanted 'to bring the matter either to bending or to breaking,' and they repeatedly threw out the threat, 'if the papists did not keep quiet, the evangelical Estates would be compelled to enforce their right of reform, and to fulfil the duty of ridding the Empire of idolatry, by promptly proceeding to fresh confiscation of monastic property.' [1]

In a draft of instructions for his ambassadors, Frederic IV. said that, through the claims of the Catholics in the matter of the convents, the Religious Peace 'was being disastrously mangled and invalidated.' He represented confiscation of Church property as a duty to conscience, adding that 'in matters of conscience no one Estate could prescribe and dictate to others.' Although, in the verdicts pronounced respecting the four convents, the Protestant assessors had formed the majority, the Elector did not scruple to say that the Imperial Chamber had in this case 'acted in opposition to its own better knowledge and sense of duty.' The ambassadors were to put all this before the Archduke.

cases, but 'in their vote not to touch on the principal point, whether the Imperial Chamber had decided rightly or wrongly, for or against the Religious Peace, but to confine themselves to general arguments and to declare that the adjournment should take place *salvo jure utriusque*' (*Frankfurter Protokoll des Reichstags in der Reichstagsakten*, p. 34, 88 fol.).

[1] Report of the Mayence official, Clement Wiederholdt, from Ratisbon, June 5, 1603. The statement of the Palatiners that 'they must keep their eyes specially wide open in the matter of the four convents, because the Catholics manifestly intended to wrest back from the evangelicals all the property they had confiscated,' seemed senseless to this official, and not seriously meant. Stieve (ii. 662) remarks: 'There is not the slightest indication that the Catholics have ever had a passing thought of attempting to get back all that the opposite party have taken; they are much too much afraid of the Protestants for this. But they are strengthening themselves more and more in the conviction that the demand of the "corresponding Estates" (the Count Palatine and his party) must not be complied with, if Catholicism and the unity of the Empire are to be saved from destruction.'

He himself told Matthias on June 21 that the Estates of the papal religion were intent on the suppression of the evangelicals. 'He owed it to honour, conscience, and position, not to give his consent to any settlement of the convent cases by revisers; if, in spite of his admonition, any decision of this sort were inserted in the Recess of the Diet, or arranged independently of it, his orders to his ambassadors were to take no further part in the proceedings of the Diet, and to leave Ratisbon.' He therefore begged Matthias to see to it that 'the evangelical Estates were not molested in matters of religion and conscience,' otherwise much disturbance and anarchy would ensue, and the Emperor's designs against the Turks would have to remain in abeyance.[1]

Formerly the Count Palatine and his associates had demanded the reference of the four convents' dispute to the Diet; now they objected to a decision by the Estates: before the documents had been examined, and the Imperial Chamber had been heard, its verdict was to be set aside as illegal and null. The Catholic Estates were simply to bow to the demands of the Protestants, and in future also not to hinder the latter in the confiscation of Church property.

The Catholic Estates were naturally not inclined to give in to all this: they insisted that the revision of the convent cases must not be given up, or else 'in all futurity justice would lie prostrate.' Maximilian of Bavaria, in his instructions to his ambassadors, said that 'the prevention of the revision must not be allowed, on account of the extremely serious and prejudicial results which would accrue to the Catholic religion and the Catholic Estates from such a proceeding. If the

[1] Wolf, *Maximilian*, II. 178–181.

Protestants by this means should succeed in obtaining that on which their hearts had so long been set, nothing was more certain than that, in all future Diets of the Empire, they would put forward the same sort of pretensions, and that in every slightest question that came up which in their opinion was connected with their religion they would hark back upon this precedent.' In the event of the Emperor being inclined to decide in favour of the Protestants, the ambassadors were to put him in mind of the consequences of such a course for himself and for the Catholic Estates. 'We will not and we cannot lay ourselves open to its being said of us, either now or in future, that it was we who gave cause and opportunity for such an intolerable burden to be imposed on the Catholics.' [1] The Catholic ambassadors were all the less ready to conform to the requirements of the Protestants, because the parties who had lost the suits had before willingly submitted their cases to the judgment of the Imperial Chamber; later on also they had themselves consented to the legal method of revision, only stipulating for an impartial committee of revision; and therefore they had no right to fall foul now of a judicial process which they themselves had recognised.[2]

The Elector of Saxony was on the side of the Catholics. Christian II. had ordered his ambassadors, in the event of its being impossible to bring the two parties to leave 'the question of the four convents at rest for the present, to vote that the revisions be immediately taken in hand and proceeded with without respect of persons,

[1] Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 182–183.

[2] 'Erklärung der Katholischen Gesandten,' in Senckenberg (*Sammlung*. iii. 208–216).

lest in the Empire salutary justice be further hindered and finally overthrown, and the territorial as well as the Religious Peace entirely abolished.'[1] 'Several times,' it says in a Mayence report, 'hard and spiteful words passed between the councillors of the Saxon Elector and those of the Count Palatine, and it looked as if they would have come to a close tussle if the Treves councillors had not intervened amicably. There was actually loud, abusive talk of treachery and murder, and the Saxon councillors said that the Count Palatine would once more plunge the Holy Empire in a sea of blood.'[2] 'I cannot leave your Excellency in ignorance of the fact,' wrote the Bavarian ambassador, Conrad of Bemmelberg, to Duke Maximilian on June 9, 'that yesterday the Saxon Elector's ambassador, Count von Mansfeld, said in confidence, that a man had been arrested at Dresden who had confessed to having received orders to attempt his Electoral Highness's life, and that this order had been given at the instigation of the Elector Palatine. In consequence of this statement his most gracious Elector and Lord had at once convened a provincial Diet, in order to consider what measures to take.' Count Mansfeld for his part 'looked forward to no good result from this, but feared further complications.'[3]

On June 15 there came the following instructions from the Emperor, who had been addressed concerning the convent cases: 'Whereas the convent cases were not questions of religion, the Estates should proceed with the deliberation on judicial matters.'

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 398, note 1.

[2] Clement Wiederholdt in the report cited above, p. 287, note 1.

[3] Wolf. *Maximilian*, ii. 177–178, note.

When on June 21 the Catholics renewed their previous votes at the council of princes, the Palatiners and the Kurbrandenburgers withdrew from the meeting without waiting for the votes of the Saxon ambassadors, and wanted to leave Ratisbon.[1] In order to avert the dissolution of the meeting, the Archduke Matthias earnestly implored them to have patience,[2] and on June 24 he brought forward a resolution to the effect that the Recess should be drawn up on the points that had been settled, and that the transactions concerning the judicial system should be postponed to another Diet or another assembly.

The Count Palatine and his party might congratulate themselves on the result of the Diet.[3]

[1] In August 1606, at an electoral Diet at Fulda, the Saxon Elector's ambassadors still complained that, in 1603, 'things had come to such extremities that the Estates were unable to obtain a hearing, but had gone away although they did not know what might be brought forward.'

[2] Report of the Frankfort delegate Hieronymus zum Jungen, June 23, 1603, in the *Reichstagsakten*, p. 91, fol. 171.

[3] Stieve (ii. 675–676) admirably sums up the results of the Diet: 'The "corresponding Estates" had completed and assured the victory they had wrung at the Spires meeting of deputies. The efficacy of the Imperial Chamber was now to depend entirely on the pleasure of the persons condemned, especially as in the year 1600 the deputies had passed the resolution that while the revision was pending, the execution of the verdict must not be proceeded with. The binding nature of the Recesses and the right of decision of the majority had been successfully contested, and a precedent had been established according to which even this imperial tribunal, the highest representative of the Empire at large, might be set at nought. It only remained to carry into effect the opposition against the juridical power of the Emperor—which already could only operate in a restricted measure—in order wholly to loosen the unity of the Empire, and to make the territorial princes completely independent.' The Calvinistic party naturally laid the blame of the dissolution of the imperial tribunal on the Catholic Estates. The latter—so said a '*Wohlmeinende warhaffte Discurs*' of the year 1616 (we shall return later on to this)—had 'stopped the whole system of justice in the realm,' for they preferred 'that there should be no justice at all in the whole Empire rather than allow three or four convent cases to be satisfactorily settled' (p. 166).

In an address to the Archduke on July 5, the ecclesiastical members of the council of princes stated that 'It was obvious, from the repeated attempts of the Protestants to postpone the course of justice, that they were bent not only on retaining possession of the four convents, but also on acquiring general unlimited power over all Catholic property. By refusing to regard the four religious cases in the light of spoliation, and to submit themselves to any lawful decision, they were depriving the Catholics in the future of all means of recovering their own possessions, and they were gaining free scope for securing to themselves all bishoprics, cloisters, and ecclesiastical possessions. For the Protestants wanted to withdraw these cases of spoliation not only from the decision of the Imperial Chamber, but also from that of the Emperor and the whole Empire, and to submit them simply to friendly arbitration. From such a course, however, no result could be expected, because the arbiters, chosen for the purpose from both religions, had once more come to loggerheads, and each party wished to decide according to its own religion. Never since the conclusion of the Augsburg Peace had this determination of the Protestant Estates to do away with this peace been so pronounced as at present. Hence it was the duty of the Catholic Estates to keep their eyes more than ever open, and to check the first beginnings, and to draw the attention of the imperial commissioners to the dangers that threatened. These Estates were bound, without further delay, to stake body, property, and life in order that the still remaining fragments of the Catholic faith, and all connected with it, might be preserved in the Fatherland, and the antagonists be as much as possible resisted in their unlawful

attempts and proceedings. The Estates sincerely hope that the Emperor will not endanger the existence of the Empire by allowing the cause of justice to be permanently stopped, and that his Majesty, in case of the Protestants not agreeing to a general imperial assembly of deputies, would confer with the Catholic Estates as to how this initial movement was to be encountered. Things have come to such a pass that the Catholics must perforce present a more united front, and must in future keep more attentive watch over the opposite party, and do all in their power to guard their religion from being suppressed.' [1]

[1] In Senckenberg, *Sammlung von ungedruckten und raren Schriften*, iii. 199-207; *Londorp. Acta publ.* pp. 77-80.

CHAPTER XVII

CATHOLIC ATTEMPTS AT REFORM [1]

WHILE the violent politico-ecclesiastical partisan struggles were raging in the Empire, the efforts after internal Church reform in Catholic territory had gained a continually increasing number of supporters; and no amount of difficulties had been able to daunt their courage: 'unmoved by hatred and persecution,' said Father Canisius, they had 'fulfilled the task laid upon them.'

Canisius, even after (in 1569) he had resigned the command of the Upper German province into the hands of Father Hoffäus, was still for the Jesuits, by the power of his personality and his indefatigable labours as teacher, preacher, missionary, author, and representative of the Popes and the Generals of the Order, 'the actual soul of the Order in Germany.' Up to his death, in 1597, he was fiercely assailed by the Protestant controversialists, and pursued with the most virulent invectives. Nevertheless, even in Protestant Germany, reverence was long entertained for the memory of the man of whom it could in truth be said: 'he was in heart and spirit throughout a genuine German,' and he had the

[1] The circumstances treated of in this and the following chapter will be dealt with again in my [Pastor's] *History of the Popes*. Besides many other unprinted documents, the abundant mass of new specialist literature will be used; this last has only been quoted from in the new edition of the present work where it was unavoidably necessary.

'salvation and peace of the German nation unceasingly at heart.' Ernest Solomon Cyprian, vice-president of the Protestant upper-consistory at Gotha, did, it is true, ascribe to him bitter hatred against the sects, but he also said in his praise: 'Canisius was extraordinarily learned and much attached to the Roman Popes; he laboured to an incredible extent in the academic chair as well as in the pulpit, travelled a great deal, wrote a catechism and other works, and acquired such renown among his co-religionists that he was ranked higher at Rome than all other theologians of his time.'[1] The Nüremberg physician Paul Freher said of him that 'by his example, by his learning, and by the creations of his genius, he had brought the Society of Jesus to high honour.' 'In piety and sincerity of character he equalled the Fathers of Christian antiquity.'[2]

'Let love, truth, and simplicity,' Canisius exhorted his associates, 'be now and ever the motto of our Order; and when we are reviled and persecuted, let us always imitate Him who prayed for His enemies: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."' After having laboured in the Order for more than fifty years, he assured his brethren in his 'spiritual testament,' that 'the multitudinous attacks, both covert and open, made on the Society of Jesus had never disgusted him with his vocation, but, on the contrary, had heightened his zeal, "for I rejoiced," he said, "that I was counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Christ, and to be falsely accused and slandered by the declared enemies of the Church. I only longed to secure to them their

[1] Cyprianus, *Tabellarium*, p. 33.

[2] *Theatrum virorum eruditione clarorum* (Norimbergae, 1688), pp. 303–304.

souls' salvation, were it even at the price of my own blood. This I should indeed have esteemed a gain, and I should thereby, according to the prayer of the Lord, have testified the sincerity of my love." '[1] What he always insisted on most emphatically, in his office of spiritual guide to priests and monks, was inward, spiritual union with Christ, and 'doing all things for love of Him alone.' 'In Christ alone lies all our hope and consolation.' His contemplations on the 'Virtues of Christ' were disseminated in many countries of Europe.[2]

He had received instructions from the Apostolic See to make known to the imperial princes, especially to the spiritual ones, the decrees of the Council of Trent, and to arrange for their enforcement. But five years after the conclusion of the Council he was forced to report to Rome that 'with the ecclesiastical doctors, and with the bishops—with very few exceptions—all his efforts had hitherto been fruitless.' 'No regard is paid to the order for erecting seminaries, and yet institutions of this sort are most necessary in Germany for the maintenance and propagation of religion. Several of the bishops—as, for instance, those of Augsburg and Eichstädt and a few others—would gladly found schools and seminaries, but they are more hindered than helped by their cathedral chapters. Added to this, the grossest ignorance in spiritual matters prevails among the clerics, even among the pastors.' He was inexhaustible in his

[1] *Testamentum Canisii*, chap. iv., in Braunsberger, i. 44.

[2] *Exhortationes domesticae*, published by Schlosser (Ruraemundae, 1876), pp. 435–443. It was these contemplations which first induced Aloysius Gonzaga, the eldest son of the Margrave of Castiglione, to enter the Order (†1591, while ministering to the plague patients) (Agricola, ii. 221 ; cf. Priess, p. 497).

complaints of the pusillanimity which had taken possession of the bishops; 'our shepherds are lacking in confidence and undauntedness, because they regard the Catholic Church in Germany as almost lost, and among the princes they know few or none on whom they can rely; further, because they see that the bishoprics are not only unjustly treated by the sectarians, but even completely suppressed, and that nobody opposes them. Accordingly, they think the ruin of the remaining bishoprics is close at hand, especially as the opponents seem possessed with an insatiable desire to annul the rights of the Catholic religion, and to appropriate the goods of the clergy.' 'And in very truth, unless we can secure a Pope who will espouse the cause of the German Church with quite special devotion, there is little hope of its being saved.' [1]

This ideal Pope appeared in the person of Gregory XIII., who, by his services to the German Church from 1572 to 1585, earned greater distinction than any other Pope of that century. Germans who for many years had moved in the highest ecclesiastical circles testified that 'Gregory might be said to have a truly German heart, so great was his concern for Germany. On no other country did he bestow such earnest solicitude; with no other did he keep up such zealous intercourse; at every sacrifice of the Mass, he said that he prayed for the German Church and the healing of her many injuries. All that he did for the restoration of German Church discipline, for the erection of schools, and the support

[1] Canisius to Francis Borgia at Rome, January 27, 1566; July 23, 1567; and April 5, 1568; Pogiani, *Epist.* 4, 406 (cf. with this Reimann in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch.* ii. 33); Boero, *Canisio*, p. 314. For the unprinted documents used by me with regard to the Jesuits, cf. vol. vii. p. 40, note 3.

of poor scholars, must for ever be fresh in the memory of us Germans, and must serve to strengthen our attachment to the Apostolic Chair. At the same time this Pope was always circumspect and wise in his relations with the secular powers.'[1] 'If all Popes were like Gregory,' said the Elector Augustus of Saxony, 'their power would always be to be feared, and they might easily exert a decisive influence over all the princes.'[2]

Within six months of his accession Gregory XIII. established a 'Congregation' which was to occupy itself exclusively with German affairs. The nine cardinals who composed this Congregation were either members of the Empire, like Otto Truchsess and Hosius, or else, like Morone and Delfino, through long residence in Germany as nuncios, they had become thoroughly acquainted with the conditions of the country. The Protocols of this Congregation, and above all the memorandum on German conditions which was laid before it, are of the highest interest.[3] Every page of these memoranda gives the most melancholy proofs of the utterly lamentable condition of the Church in Germany. The corruption, especially of the canons of noble birth, who placed the greatest obstacles in the way of Church reform by the oppressive stipulations which they imposed on bishops, comes in for the severest

[1] Letter of Bernhard Perneder from Rome, January 2, 1586, to the ecclesiastical councillor of Mayence, Christopher Hagemann. That Perneder's eulogy is altogether just is seen from the valuable publication of W. E. Schwarz, quoted below, at n. 3; cf. also *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xxiv. ff.

[2] Maffei, *Ann. Gregorii XIII.* ii. 468; cf. v. Bezold, ii. 346, note.

[3] Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, pp. 71–131, gives the protocols of the sessions of the German Congregation in the years 1573–1578, from a MS. of the Borghese library. See *ibid.* xvi. ff. concerning the foundation or rather the re-quickening of the German Congregation in 1573.

censure. It was the custom of these gentlemen to draw the revenues of their offices and to relegate their ecclesiastical duties to the care of burgher vicars. Hence the saying: 'The vicars go to church for the canons, but the canons go to hell instead of the vicars.' [1] Many of the cathedral chapters had received into their ranks adherents of the new doctrines, both secret and avowed. The result was that the German bishoprics fell largely to the share of quite unsuitable persons; repulse of the new doctrines, as well as the education of the clergy, and vigilance over them were all alike neglected.

'The greatest danger for the German Church,' said Cardinal Otto Truchsess in a memorandum [2] destined for Gregory, 'lies in the large number of apostate bishops and canons who have been too long tolerated among us and allowed to continue unpunished in disobedience to the Apostolic Chair. These men are nothing more than secular lords, and they mix up spiritual and secular matters in an arbitrary fashion, and care neither for God nor man. Such a state of things will bring ruin not only on the Roman Church, but on the whole Empire, if adequate means of help are not speedily discovered. The clergy show resentment at every kind of reform, and they reject the Reform decrees of the Council of Trent, whenever the latter clash with their own statutes, privileges, or customs. If immoral priests are removed from their posts, they can always find

[1] Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, xlix.

[2] *Pro cognitione praesentis status Germaniae*. For the time of its composition see Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, xxiii. ff. It is a matter for immense thankfulness that Schwarz (pp. 1-19) has given the complete text of this important memorandum, which was still in MS. when Janssen was engaged on this work. That the memorandum was not from the pen of Canisius, as Janssen assumed, may pass for certainty; the authorship of Cardinal Truchsess is shown by a MS. of the papal secret archives.

protectors and patrons in neighbouring churches, by reason of the dearth of priests; or else they join the ranks of the heretics, from whom they get high and important appointments; for apostates are what the sectarians most delight in.' The places thus left vacant cannot be filled up again, owing to the want of worthy priests. And thus every bishop—so runs the terrible confession—'finds himself compelled, against his will, to tolerate numbers of priests and pastors who are nothing better than Simonists, men who are utterly unqualified, profligate livers, excommunicated persons, criminal offenders, concubinists, drunkards, dishonourable wretches, apostates from the faith.'

It was also a special misfortune for the bishops that they could find no able, God-fearing men, full of strength and devotion, to help them in the management of their dioceses. Cardinal Truchsess did not deny that improvement had taken place in several dioceses; on the contrary, he dwelt with delight on the bright spots amid the darkness. Already, he says, many bishops 'are giving daily proof of true religious zeal, and would gladly apply the best remedies if only the Pope and the Emperor would support them.' He urged that the Apostolic See should treat with such prelates in a paternal manner respecting the remedies to be used: 'For most of the bishops are debarred from human help, and must be daily prepared to encounter fresh arrogance and fresh injuries.' They urgently needed good coadjutors. Since there were no efficient canons at hand, the Cardinal begged the Pope to appoint a few commissary-generals in the different provinces, for the settlement of difficult cases.

First and foremost, however, attention must be

turned to training up a body of thoroughly well-qualified clergy.

'The heretics are disunited and schismatic, they fight and persecute each other fiercely, both in religious and secular matters. They do not trust each other in the least. Their followers are disgusted with such a multitude of sects and such endless changes, and are returning every year in incredibly large numbers, and of their own accord, to the bosom of the Mother Church. I do not doubt that if they saw the Catholics freed from all public scandals, and if we had first-rate evangelical workers, there would every day be still more numerous returns to the fold.' The truth of this statement was exemplified in the case of the Jesuits, who, by their indefatigable labours, brought back daily to the Catholic faith numbers of wandering sheep. The adversaries, indeed, made it a complaint against the Society of Jesus that from no other scholars did they suffer so much injury. So long as there was still a dearth of well-managed seminaries in the different bishoprics, the great thing was to encourage and keep up the general seminary at Rome, the German College.

The cessation of mutual relations between the Apostolic See and the German Estates, both Catholic and Protestant, had led to a deplorable state of things. The Pope was therefore entreated to do all in his power to effect a renewal of friendly and confidential relations with the Emperor and the princes, both spiritual and temporal, and also with the nobles and the towns; to encourage and hearten them by apostolic letters and by the agency of experienced and exemplary nuncios, to bestow on them his support and to make frequent declarations of his paternal love to the German nation.

'There were indeed some who feared that such a course might excite the Emperor and the Protestant princes to all manner of suspicions against the Pope. But if the latter were only seeking the salvation of souls, without any other motives, he would have nothing to fear. The Germans would never be won back to the Church by mere silence and surrender on her part, by lengthy, mischievous postponements and delays: the work could only be effected by tender solicitude, by admonition, and by undesisting labour.'

The Pope, Truchsess urged, must use his influence with the Emperor to prevent his 'according either regalia, seat, or vote to any prelate who, after being elected, violated the existing concordat and its obligations by not seeking confirmation of his appointment from Rome, or who refused to subscribe to the Tridentine Confession, or to receive ordination.' It must also be urged with equal force on the Emperor that, in respect of the Peace of Augsburg, he must not concede to the Protestants any further innovations of a nature injurious to the Catholics, but that he must at all points be guided by the Public Peace and the Religious Peace, and maintain these intact.[1]

Gregory XIII. adopted these counsels for guidance in all his transactions.[2] Above all—and this was a factor of high import—he recognised the justice of the opinion held by Truchsess, as indeed by all keen-sighted

[1] '. . . sed omnia reduci et conservari mandet secundum imperiales constitutiones circa pacem publicam et pacem religionis' (Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, p. 11).

[2] Also with regard to the Religious Peace. The demands and the aims of the Calvinists went far beyond the terms of this Peace. In order to be beforehand with them the Pope wanted to effect the confirmation of the Peace at the Election Diet at Ratisbon in 1575, by means of his nuncio Delfino (Stieve, *Ursprung, Anmerkungen*, p. 94, note 2).

observers, that there was pressing need for better and more ample representation of the Holy See in Germany, and he shaped all his policy accordingly. It had already long been felt that the one nuncio at Vienna was not sufficient for the whole Empire: the unfavourable situation of Vienna on the eastern frontier of the Empire, the exceptionally distressed position of the Catholic Church in Germany, and the complication of affairs in its midst, called loudly for the presence in the country of several papal agents. 'Gregory XIII. took the matter in hand with prompt resolution. He was fully aware both of the importance which might accrue to the work of a number of nuncios engaged in raising the tone of German Catholicism through constant influence brought to bear on the bishops and on the lower clergy, through visitations and through publication of the Reform decrees of Trent, and also to the advantage which the papal government would reap by being brought in all these ways into immediate communication with the different territorial divisions of Germany.' In the same year, 1573, in which the German Congregation was founded, three additional nuncios were sent to Germany—the Dominican Felician Ninguarda, as papal commissioner to the archbishopric of Salzburg to support the reform labours of the Archbishop there; the nuncio extraordinary Caspar Gropper, to the Rhine district, especially Cologne; and the ordinary nuncio Bartholomew Portia, to South Germany. The 'South German nunciature,' founded by Portia's appointment, lasted for ten years; side by side with it a special, permanent nunciature was established in 1580 for the domains of the Archduke Carl of Styria. In the year 1584 a third new and permanent nunciature was founded on German

soil by the second mission of John Francis Bonomi to Cologne.[1] As early as 1585 Bonomi held a Diocesan synod at Liege, which accepted the decrees of the Council of Trent. Unfortunately, it was not granted to this earnest, enthusiastic Church reformer to devote himself for any length of time to his important mission, for he died on February 25, 1587. So conscientious was Bonomi in the observance of the Church rules, that even on his death-bed he would not avail himself of the fasting dispensation.[2] When Rome again began sending men of this sort to Germany, there was real ground for hope of a radical improvement in religious conditions. There was indeed an enormous amount of work to do: on this point all are unanimous who possessed accurate insight into the state of German affairs. A memorandum of Peter Canisius for Claudius Aquaviva, who had been at the head of the Order of Jesuits since 1581, is of great importance in this respect. The conditions of Germany and its ecclesiastical requirements are described in its pages with as much penetration and accuracy as in the memorandum of Cardinal Truchsess.

The German bishops, said Canisius, 'are mostly of noble birth, but as a rule they have had from childhood an unhallowed bringing-up in German luxury; they know little about sacred matters, and are inordinately set on court splendour and worldly power. Whereas

[1] *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xxviii. ff. and 719 ff.; cf. Unkel *loc. cit.* and Schwarz, xxxiii.–xli.; for Ninguarda see below. K. Schellhass has commenced the publication of the reports of the nuncio Count Bartholomew Portia (*Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, part iii. vol. iii.: 'The South-German Nunciature of Bartholomew von Portia, 1573–1574.' Berlin. 1896).

[2] Unkel in the *Hist. Jahrb.* xii. 738. See above, p. 90, note 1

they regard themselves far more as princes of the Empire than as shepherds of Christ's sheep, they spend their time, their labour, and their money on secular, not on spiritual, things. For this reason they neither fulfil the episcopal office themselves, nor do they depute the task to other well-qualified men; they trouble themselves little about the visitation and reform of churches and convents, about the holding of synods, about ordination examinations for the clergy, about even a partial enforcement of the penal regulations of the Church.'

Among the whole body ecclesiastic there exist still such a number of vices, and such gross ignorance in things divine and ecclesiastical, that it may well be a matter of wonder 'how, with such shepherds and Church ministers in all directions, so many people still remain true to the Catholic faith.' [1] 'For as the people are in Germany, so are the priests, wholly addicted to luxury, abandoned to carnal excesses. Living in company with the new sons of Belial, they have learnt to do their works; they will scarcely put up with any yoke; they are blind leaders of the blind, believing that almost everything that pleases them can be harmonised with their Catholic faith; and thus through their fault the name of God and the true religion are brought into utmost contempt among the heretics.'

Concerning the people in general, Canisius goes on: 'They suffer heavily, partly on account of the grievous scandals among their priests, partly on account of the venomous sectarian errors with which they are strongly tainted. Like a reed shaken by the wind, they sway

[1] Cf. on this point the same Father's 'Memorandum to Gregory XIII.' May 10, 1574, in Theiner, *Annales*, i. 243.

now this way, now that. Numbers of them declare that they do not know what to believe and which of the parties to join. The way of the Catholics, however, is as follows: they consider it sufficient to hold by the principal articles of the Catholic faith, while at the same time caring little or nothing about the fulfilment of the commands of the Church, the recognition of the papal authority, or the acceptance of a great many dogmas which have been summed up under the name of human traditions, and made hateful to the German people by heretical cunning. I will not speak of the sinful practice of usury which has come quite into vogue among the people, and has been sanctioned by State laws. Neither will I dwell on the open lasciviousness which has become the universal habit among the Germans, and is the inevitable accompaniment of their frequent carousals.'

Under this condition of things Canisius most emphatically urged on the General of the Order that without his (the General's) special permission no Jesuit must be suffered to undertake the office of father confessor to bishops and archbishops. For, he said, 'we have very few physicians who are qualified to administer even partial healing to such patients, or to obtain from them even moderate promises. There is great danger that more harm may result to the Order than good be done by it through these father confessors if they exact from their penitents all that they ought to exact. If, however, our members should have the opportunity of speaking with any such prelates outside of the confessional, they must always consult carefully with their superiors before addressing the dignitaries.' Above all, he repeated emphatically, the bishops must be charged 'to spare no labour in founding clerical

seminaries, or at any rate to establish some as soon as possible in a Catholic University.' 'For if they do not establish such seminaries, they will not be able to conquer the worst of the religious evils, viz. the lamentable dearth of priests, and they will have to go on putting up with unworthy, wholly immoral, pastors, because they can find no better ones to replace them: and thus they will always, more or less, carry serpents in their bosoms, and neither personally nor by the agency of others will they preserve the nation from corruption.' [1]

The Pope, it was said, ought also to maintain a fixed number of students in the interior of Germany, as he did at Rome, in order to form a staff of efficient labourers in the German vineyards, by whose good example the bishops themselves might be awakened from their sleep.

'The papal nuncios must seek out good theologians capable of combating the heresies, and of defending the Catholic doctrine and the Apostolic See.' 'Some few at least should be incited to this holy work of authorship, and their books, after due examination, should be printed in Germany itself.'

Any further seizures of bishoprics and other Church property must be prevented by appeal to the Emperor.

The Pope must be no less assiduous in effecting the removal of the new religionist canons from the cathedral churches, 'let them be ever so illustrious and nobly born.' 'The worst possible lot must needs befall all churches in which not only deacons and provosts, but even bishops, are selected from the ranks of such canons. So great is the insubordination that prevails that about

[1] Minutio Minucci also complains of the dearth of priests in his memorandum on the condition of the Catholic Church in Germany (1588) in the *Nuntiaturberichten*, iii. 1, 760, 765; cf. also pp. 750, 752, 755, on the corruption of the chapters in Germany.

fourteen bishops have refused to apply to the Apostolic See for their confirmation, and they do not appear even to respect the Emperor. If the door is not closed against such heretics, fresh bishoprics will be constantly seized by them, secularised and devastated.'

From the new bishops and archbishops, in addition to the oaths already prescribed before confirmation, a fresh solemn pledge must also be exacted that they will allow no one who has not sworn to the Tridentine Confession to receive consecration, or to be appointed to a benefice, or to the posts of councillor, schoolmaster, or official. They must exclude open, avowed heretics from their courts and churches, must appoint capable inspectors of churches and cloisters, and restore the sacraments of confirmation and extreme unction wherever these have lapsed.

Germany, says Canisius at the end of his memorandum, needs, as it were, motherly care and devotion from the Apostolic See.[1] The Pope must take to heart the words of Scripture: 'A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench.'

Thus, after well-nigh forty years of labour on the part of the Jesuits—labour abundantly rewarded, it is true, in many parts of the Empire by strong consolidation of Catholic faith and revival of Christian life and character—there were still present in the German Church evils of colossal magnitude, and difficulties that seemed almost insurmountable. 'Who can deny,' said Canisius, ten years after the conclusion of the Trent Council, 'that the decrees of the Fathers have already exercised a powerful and an altogether beneficial influence on Germany? But the large number of old abuses which

[1] *Materna quadam indulgentia.*

have not yet been removed are perpetually aggravated by reason of the anarchy that prevails in religious matters. But to be discouraged thereby is to be vanquished in advance.'

The guiding principle of the German Jesuit leader, as revealed in his writings and his letters, is as follows: 'He who wishes to heal must first seek to discover the seat of the evil and the cause of the evil, and must also have the courage to proclaim these openly and honourably; he must use Christian wisdom and discretion in applying the right means of healing, and, without concern for himself, undaunted by all dangers and difficulties, he must pursue the lofty aim of furthering God's glory and the salvation of souls. He who seeks himself will not find the grace of God; but without this grace all labour is empty human toil. Only that which we perform in God has any substance and fruit.' 'Let us march forward, led as it were by His hand, at once circumspectly and unfalteringly.'

With unfaltering tread, in wisdom and discretion, the Order pursued its aim. It won for itself in Germany an ever widening sphere of multitudinous activity, owing first and foremost to the devoted self-subordination of each separate member to the joint action of the whole body.[1] The intellectual ascendency of the Society, its complete harmony and unanimity, and the extensive results of its operations were recognised even

[1] The Berlin Professor Paulsen, p. 282, says admirably of the Order of Jesuits: 'It has in its activity something of the silent but ceaseless *modus operandi* of the forces of nature: without violence and noise of warfare, without agitation and revolution, it presses on, step by step, scarcely ever making one tread backwards. Confidence and strength characterise its every movement. True, these are not qualities that make men amiable; but no one is amiable who is without human weakness.'

by those Protestants whose aim was to show up the whole sum of Jesuit achievement as 'a work of Beelzebub, the chief of the devils,' and who denounced the 'unusually strict, chaste, retired and laborious habits of the Jesuit' as 'accursed Satanic arts.' Fear of the Jesuits was universal among the Protestants, and it increased from year to year as the Order took root more and more firmly while schism and party spirit gained ground in the Protestant camp. Before the advent of the Jesuits, the Protestants had felt confident that 'by means of the princes and the magistrates, and the ministers of the Word, the last remnants of the antichristian, idolatrous papacy would speedily be rooted out of the Empire.' This confidence no longer existed, 'for which the Jesuits alone were to blame.'[1] The enemy seemed at last to be quite disposed of, wrote the Heidelberg Calvinistic theologian Boquin in 1576, when lo, he suddenly raised up a new army and entrenched himself in his principal stronghold. 'And meanwhile, while we were absorbed in pitiable wrangles, and were allowing fresh strife and disturbance to be perpetually stirred up by turbulent, mischievous agitators, the enemy were quietly and skilfully working and watching, till at last, by means of their new garrison, they have restored their citadel to such admirable condition, that the whole crew of Antichrist now plainly entertains the hope of shortly recovering their former prestige, dignity, and power.'[2] The Hessian superintendent, George Migrinus, was deeply distressed, in 1582, by the fact that even Protestant parents of noble and burgher standing did not scruple

[1] See our remarks, vol. viii. 212-213.

[2] *Assertio veteris ac veri Christianismi adversus novum et fictum Jesuitismum seu Societatem Jesu* (1576), Preface.

to send their children to the schools of the Jesuits, and that they extolled their 'work and industry.'[1] 'Under the semblance of diligent instruction in useful arts,' Cyriacus Spangenberg complained in 1594, 'the Jesuits mislead the young people of Germany in an abominable manner. But what, on the other hand, are the evangelicals doing for their young people? Verily there is no such zeal and diligence among them, by a long way, and they do not let their young folk cost them one tenth part as much.'[2] Another preacher in the same year wrote as follows: 'It is as plain as a pikestaff to all who are not blind to everyday facts, why it is that the Jesuits are so highly esteemed by the papists, why their glory and renown go on augmenting, and why their repute among the evangelicals, both nobles and commoners, increases to such an extent that grave evil is to be feared in consequence. How many men are there among ourselves who are as learned and well-educated as the Jesuits? How many of us are as zealous and as expert in educating the young, in preaching, teaching, and instructing? How many are as assiduous and indefatigable in visiting the sick, the infirm, the lepers and the plague-stricken as are these emissaries of the Roman Antichrist? Added to this, unanimity and co-operation are the very essence of their activity, while with us, on the contrary, strife, quarrelling, hatred, envy, and hostilities reign among the teachers of the Gospel. How can we wonder that the people flock to them?'[3] In a similar strain the Protestant Andreas Dudith had written from Breslau on September 28, 1581, to the

[1] *Papistische Inquisition*, p. 722. [2] *Adelsspiegel*, ii. 75[b].

[3] *Nothgedrungene Errinnerung und Vermahnung an alle, so dem Evangelium wohl zugethan sein* (1594), Bl. 3.

physician Crato of Crafftheim: 'I, for my part, am not surprised when I hear of anyone ranging himself on the side of the Jesuits, especially anyone who is not well schooled in controversy. For if we judge by outward appearances, we cannot do otherwise than bestow immense praise on the Jesuits. They are men of varied scholarship; they are eloquent speakers; they teach and preach, they write and debate; they impart free instruction to the young, and that with untiring ardour; and, in addition to all this, they are models of pure morality and of humility. Turn we, on the other hand, to those who make their boast of the true evangel, and we discover weak-minded prejudice, want of unity, strife, and wrangling, mutual persecution, and other worse failings which I dare not enumerate; besides which their learning is by no means great—not great enough certainly to bear any comparison with the scholarly culture of the Jesuits.' [1]

On the Catholic side princes, statesmen and scholars, bishops and monks regarded the rapid spread of the Order, in the teeth of so many and great difficulties, as quite a special work of Divine Providence.[2]

[1] 'Equidem non miror, cum audio aliquem ad Jesuitas transire, praesertim si non sit multum diuque in controversiis cognoscendis versatus. Nam illa quidem, quae in oculos incurrunt, valde plausibilia sunt. Commendat eos varia eruditio, eloquentia, assiduus in docendo, cōncionando, scribendo, disputando, pueros sine mercede instituendo, labor vitaeque innocentia et modestia. Contra, qui oculos conjiciant in eorum, qui Evangelii nomine superbiunt, fastum atque impotentiam, in dissidia, contentiones, mutuas persecutiones, alia vitia, quæ non lubet commemorare, in literis vero non magnam doctrinam, certe non tantam, quae cum illorum eruditione comparari possit, non magnam habent causam cur magnopere mirentur, si quis a nostris ad illos deficiat' (in Sudhoff, C. Olevianus and Z. Ursinus [Elberfeld, 1857], pp. 504–505). At Breslau two Jesuits appeared as preachers in 1581; they were not at once, however, successful in founding a college in this town (see Grünhagen, *Gesch. Schlesiens*, xi. 127).

[2] See the opinions of the Carthusians Laurentius Surius (*Comment.*

The number of the colleges, schools, and mission stations of the Order increased from one decade to another. To those founded in 1575 [1] there were added in the Rhenish Province in 1578 a mission station at Aix-la-Chapelle; in 1580 a college at Coblentz,[2] and one at Molsheim; in 1585 at Erfurt and at Paderborn; in 1586 a mission station at Bonn, and one at Hildesheim in 1587; in 1588 a college at Münster, and one at Emmerich in 1592; 1601–1603 a mission station at Ritberg; 1604 a college at Hagenau; 1605 a mission station at Essen, and one at Xanten in 1609; 1609 a college at Worms; 1612 a college at Aschaffenburg; 1614 a mission station at Meppen; 1615 a college at Reuss, one at Schlettstadt, and one at Ensisheim.

The spread was no less rapid in the Upper German Province. Among other Jesuit institutions there were erected in 1574 a college at Lucerne; in 1576 a novitiate at Landsberg; in 1579 a college at Augsburg; 1580 a college at Freiburg in Switzerland; 1585 a mission station at Ellwangen, one at Günzburg, one at Gmünd, and one at Miesbach; in 1586 a college at Ratisbon, 1591 one at Altötting; in 1593 a settlement at Biburg, in 1597 another at Ebersberg; in 1604 a college at

brevis rerum in orbe gestarum, Coloniae, 1568, p. 459) and Erhard von Winheim (*Sacrarium Agrippinae*, edition of 1736, p. 153 ff.); of the Bishops Theodore of Paderborn (Strunck, *Ann. Paderb.* iii. 658 ff.), and George Stobäus von Lavant (Hausiz, *Germ. Sacra*, ii. 684); of the Archbishop James of Treves (Hontheim, *Hist. Trever. diplom.* iii. 26); of the Archdukes Albert V. and William V. of Bavaria (*Cartas de S. Ignatio*, ii. 532; Adlzreiter, ii. 269; Hund, *Metrop. Salisburg.* ii. 284), and so forth. For the difficulties with which the Jesuits had to struggle (as late as 1579), see the accounts in the *Nuntiaturberichten*, iii. 1, 267 ff.

[1] See our statements, vol. viii. p. 242 ff. 327, 334 ff.

[2] See Dominicus, *Gesch. der Stiftung des Jesuiten Kollegs im Koblentz* (Progr. des Gymnasiums zu Koblentz, 1862).

Constance, in 1611 one at Bamberg, in 1616 a college at Eichstädt, and one at Neuburg on the Danube.

With each of these colleges a gymnasium was connected, and in far the greater number of them the pupils counted several hundreds. Thus, for instance, in the gymnasium at Cologne, which was increased by seven additional classes in 1577, the number of day pupils and boarders in 1578 was 840, and three years later, over 1,000.[1] At Treves, in the year 1581, the number of pupils was nearly 1,000;[2] at Coblentz, Spires, and Heiligenstadt, 200 respectively.[3] At Fulda, since 1585 the number had varied from 400 to 500.[4] At Munich the numbers grew from 600 in the year 1587 to 800 in 1589, and to 900 in 1602;[5] at Wurzburg, from 700 in 1590 to 800 in 1593, and to 1,070 in 1604;[6] at Dillingen, from 570 in 1595 to 730 in 1605;[7] at Augsburg, from 300 in 1585 to 400 in 1606, and ten years later to 600.[8] The institutions in the Austrian province of the Order rejoiced in similar growth.

Wherever the Fathers went their influence never remained restricted to the school area, but always

[1] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1581*, pag. 169. Reiffenberg, pp. 169, 205; Bianco, i. 922–923.

[2] Reiffenberg, p. 223; cf. Zirngiebl, p. 310.

[3] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1581*, pp. 177, 178; Wolf, *Gesch. des Gymnasiums zu Heiligenstadt* (Göttingen, 1813), Appendix, p. 5; cf. Knieb, *Gesch. der Reformation und Gegenreformation auf dem Eichsfeld*, p. 154. For the other work of the Jesuits on the Eichsfeld, see *ibid.* 173 ff., 219 ff., 261 ff.

[4] Komp, *Zweite Schule Fuldas*, pp. 18, 30.

[5] Bauer, from the *Diarium gymnasii S. J. Monacensis* (Munich, 1878), p. 11 ff.

[6] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1590–1591*, p. 355; *ad a. 1593*, p. 239; *ad a. 1604*, p. 610.

[7] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1594–95*, p. 359; *ad a. 1605*, p. 618.

[8] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1585*, p. 266; Agricola, i. 346; Braun, *Gesch. des Jesuitenkollegs in Augsburg*, p. 155; *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1606*, p. 385; Mangold, *Coll. August.* (Augustae Vindel. 1786), p. 61.

speedily embraced the widest sections of the population. The Jesuits were indefatigable as preachers. As early as 1565 a Father had been stationed at Innsbruck to deliver religious addresses to the cultivated classes of the capital of the Tyrol. 'Every Sunday and feast-day he delivered his discourses for an hour after mid-day, and among his congregation were members of the Government and the judicial bench. The Jesuits seldom appear as preachers at court, but they often officiate in the pulpits of the town parishes of Innsbruck. We see them from the town perambulating the neighbourhood.' In places which were suffering from great spiritual neglect, they undertook the instruction of children and adults in Christian doctrine, and from year to year they drew larger circles round them; wherever one of them mounted the pulpit, a large crowd of listeners thronged to hear. In 1586 we find them working in the mining districts; a year later they receive episcopal faculties granting them general leave to hold missions everywhere in the country. The German nation is much impressed by the contrast between the loose behaviour, the coarse manners, and the inferior culture of the clergy (whereby the latter have fallen terribly in the estimation of the people), and the earnestness, the wise demeanour, and the superior learning of the Fathers, who proclaim the Church's doctrines with such convincing eloquence from the pulpit, and who have such marvellous power in the confessional to reach the consciences of penitents.[1]

The Jesuits applied themselves with special ardour to founding seminaries for poor students. At Munich, through their solicitude, the Georgianum was erected

[1] Hirn, i. 232-233.

by Albert V. in the year 1574; later on, this institution had forty free scholarships. Similar seminaries sprang up at Ingoldstadt, Würzburg, Innsbruck, Hall, Graz and Prague. At Augsburg, Canisius had begun as early as 1559 to interest himself in the 200 cathedral scholars, who were most of them indigent, and to make it possible for them to share a common life in one house; he collected alms for them from the ecclesiastical princes and the wealthy people who attended his sermons in the cathedral. Following his example, Father Volk went begging round Augsburg, and in the one year 1590 he obtained 1,400 florins for needy students.[1] For the benefit of the latter, separate boarding schools gradually grew up in connection with nearly all the colleges.

The grandest testimony to the Jesuit schools is the confidence which the people at all times reposed in them.

A Latin address of the Dillingen Fathers to the students there gives a good idea of the spirit in which instruction and education were carried on by the Jesuits. 'The greatest harm'—so they say—'is done to Christian society by those persons who would separate the study of languages from the exercises of religion, who would divorce eloquence from wisdom, and philosophic learning from the teaching of morals. All the more, therefore, do we consider it our duty to devote all possible pains, ardour, and diligence, as beseems true builders-up of Christian virtue, as much to the preservation of the

[1] Agricola, i. 58–59, 138, 150, 346; Sacchinus, *Vita Canisii*, p. 161; cf. Zirngiebl, pp. 273, 279–280, 288, 294, 298. For Cologne, cf. Reiffenberg, p. 73, notes c and d; for Pruntrut, Agricola, ii. 315; for Ingolstadt, Prantl, *Geschichte der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität* (Munich, 1872), i. 352 ff.; for Wurzburg, Braun, *Heranbildung des Klerus*, p. 145 ff.

pure doctrines of the faith as to the formation of pure morals; to aim with all our might at the combination of learning and virtue, and at promoting the general pursuit of human as well as of divine knowledge.' 'The students must become accustomed from their earliest years to being equally well trained in the arts and sciences and in good morals, in order that they may become useful members of the Fatherland and of the Church, and—which must always be the first consideration—that they may live righteously and happily to the eternal glory of Jesus Christ.'[1]

The Marian Student Congregations, with their strict organisation, founded by the Jesuits for the purpose of generally elevating the tone of religious and moral life and action, attained a high degree of importance. 'Under the banner of the Holy Virgin,' the students 'were pledged to sacred emulation in all the departments of learning, and in the practice of all virtue and piety; they were sworn to avoid evil societies and immoderate drinking-bouts, and, in close brotherly companionship, to incite each other to innocent mirth.' The rules of the Union prescribed also specially that sick members were to be visited and refreshed with bodily and spiritual help. Out of the Marian Congregations, and keeping always in close connection with them, the so-called 'Academies' were developed in 1569: institutions intended to afford the more gifted scholars opportunity and stimulus to higher scientific culture. 'Under the name Academy,' it says in a plan of study of the Order, 'we understand a union of students, chosen from the

[1] Haut, *Gesch. der Studienanstalt Dillingen* (Dillingen, 1854), pp. 36, 39; Hattler, *James Rem*, p. 57. On the internal organisation of the schools and the 'programme of study' we shall treat later in a special section.

general body of scholars, with one of our Fathers for Superior, who shall meet together for special scientific studies.' [1]

The first Marian Congregations on German soil were founded at Cologne in 1575 by Francis Koster, a teacher at the Jesuit College.[2] Later on he gave the members of the Union directions as to the mode of behaviour they should observe towards the heretics. To advocate proselytising was far from his thoughts. With those sectarians, he says, who independently set up new and false doctrines, they must, according to the injunctions of St. Paul, and the coinciding views of all teachers of the Church, have but little intercommunication—nay, rather, they should avoid all intercourse whatever with them. If the sectarians should happen to raise any point of dispute, a simple answer should be given them; in their arrogance they wanted to upset everything, and they would not let themselves be convinced. As for the 'slanders, curses, and revilings which they were in the habit of hurling at us, we must as it were turn deaf ears to them. For just as the plaintiff who cannot with reason defend his unrighteous cause before the judge begins to fall foul of the court, so likewise the heretic, when he despairs of solid proofs, has recourse

[1] *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, ii. 542. Fuller details on the origin and early development of the Congregations or Sodalities are given in Niedereger, pp. 3–36; cf. also Zirngiebl, pp. 47–49. 'Old and young, high and low, learned and unlearned, crowded into these unions.' 'Princes and counts, clergy of high and low degree, masters and apprentices, collegians and litterati joined their ranks.' The Jesuits also founded separate congregations for women and young girls. For these latter I know of no example to cite. The Catholic Reformation and the Marian sodalities in Bohemia are exhaustively treated by Svoboda (S.J.) with the help of rare authorities in *Katolická reformace a mariinská Družina v. Království českém* (Brünn, 1889).

[2] Niedereger, p. 20; cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, 137.

to abusive language in order to turn an orderly disputation into a battle of words.' The Marians, however, must not pay any heed to this insulting language, but rather they should feel pity for such people, meet them with love and friendship, and pray to God for them.[1] At Cologne 'the new Brotherhood,' which was soon joined by adults also, high and low, lay and clerical, received 'a powerful impetus;' the number of its student members amounted in the year 1588 to 250.[2]

The second academic sodality was founded at Würzburg in 1575; the Bishop, the University professors, and many other persons, lay and clerical, enrolled themselves as members. Three other Marian Unions were formed in connection with the five lower schools and among the burghers.[3] The Marian Union of the Munich Jesuit College, founded in 1577, counted among its members the papal nuncio (Bartholomew Count of Portia), several Benedictine abbots and ducal councillors, and Duke William II. himself. The son of the latter, Duke Maximilian, was for several years head of the Union, and he admitted into it his brother and three princes of Baden. In 1584 he was appointed president of all the Student Congregations existing in Germany. A papal bull of December 5, 1584, formed them all into a united body, and conferred on them a definite constitution.[4] The Marian Students' Union at Ingolstadt was in a specially flourishing condition. The heart and soul of the society there was Father James Rem, who devoted himself for forty-six years to the education of

[1] *Enchiridion controversiarum*, for the Congregationists (1608), pp. 32–34. Concerning intercourse with heretics in good faith, see pp. 35–36.

[2] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1588*, p. 160.

[3] Gropp, *Wirtzburgische Chronik*, i. 360.

[4] Niedereger, pp. 26, 29–31, 47–50.

the young in seminaries and boarding-schools, and who was reverenced as a saint by the students.[1] Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, afterwards Emperor, was the most prominent member of the sodality during his student days. When this society took part in the public mourning procession on Good Friday, 1594, Ferdinand, in the blue mantle, which was the garb of the Union, took it in turn with the Bavarian princes, Philip, Ferdinand, and Albert, to carry the crucifix at the head of the procession.[2] At Dillingen, where as early as 1580 two hundred youths had joined the sodality, the brothers of the League, headed by a prince, three counts, and thirteen barons, betook themselves once to the hospital during the carnival, washed the feet of the patients, and gave them each a present.[3] At Innsbruck the members of the Marian Congregation, founded in 1578, undertook general pilgrimages during the carnival, and excited thereby great astonishment among the people.[4] At the Jesuit College at Graz there arose, side by side with the Marian Congregation, a students' League 'of the Holy Ghost,' which had for its object first and foremost the performance of acts of corporal and spiritual mercy. In the year 1582 Archduke Charles became a member of this Union. Among the Catholic nobles and burghers there were few who in days of sickness, especially in the hour of death, did not wish for a member of the Union at their bedsides. 'To shallow-minded, cynical worldlings,' writes a contemporary,

[1] Fuller details in Hattler, *Rem*, iii. 53, 105, 148–151, 192, 221, 309.

[2] Agricola, ii. 77–78.

[3] Hattler, *Rem*, p. 71; Flotto, p. 283. Concerning a penitential procession of the Ingolstadt Congregationists during Christmas 1592, cf. Agricola, ii. 39–40.

[4] Hirn, i. 274.

'it may seem eccentric, even laughable, that young men given up to study should act the part of comforters and helpers of the sick, and should seek out the poor in their lowly abodes, as is so often done by the scholars in the schools of the Society of Jesus (and as I myself have seen at Graz and at Vienna); but verily it will not seem laughable in the eyes of God, and Christ's commandment and the reward promised by Him will not be missed by such young men. When the scions of noble families, of the very highest indeed—as is known to be frequently the case—in the midst of their stormy youth become practised in such works of Christian beneficence, the gain and profit must undoubtedly be great, not only for themselves in their future lives, but also for those who are subject to them, and over whom they have to rule.' [1]

[1] Socher, i. 279–280; Niedereger, p. 33; Peinlich, *Gesch. des Gymnasiums zu Graz, Programm zum Jahre 1869*, p. 56, note; *Die Preisung Maria ein fürnehmlich Mittel zur Preisung Gottes und Jhesu Christi* (Ingolstadt, 1597), Bl. H. Concerning the distinguished members of the Vienna sodality, cf. Niedereger, p. 56 ff. For those of the Innsbruck Congregation see Hirn, i. 274; cf. Krones, *Gesch. der Universität Graz*, p. 283 ff., where the founding of the Graz sodality 'Mariae Virginis' is placed in the year 1595. The great philologist Justus Lipsius, who studied literature and philosophy under the Jesuits, and who was a zealous member of the Marian Congregation at Löwen, after a life full of change and fluctuation, acknowledged on his death-bed that his most comforting recollection was that of his entry into the Marian Union. All that was best in him, he said, he owed to the Jesuits; he was devoted to them with his whole heart (*Imago primi saeculi*, p. 774; Niedereger, p. 86; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, Jahrg. 1884, p. 250; *Justi Lipsii Epist. Centur.* iii. 29, 32). In this last place he writes, in January 1598, to the Augsburg Jesuit Pontanus: 'O institutionem vestram olim mihi utilem! inhaeret ea et inhaesit, atque illa Pallas fuit, quae inter tempestates, imo naufragia servavit hunc Ulyssem.' The pride of the Marian Congregation was a former scholar of the Jesuit College of Prague, the renowned physician and author, Hippolytus Guarinoni of Trent. He had already joined the League in early youth, and after he had settled down as physician to the Archduchesses Maria Christina and Eleonore at Hall, he filled the office

The Marian Congregations went largely on the plan of forming close mutual interconnections. The famous Father Possevin had already in 1579 brought about a union of the Innsbruck Congregation with that of Rome. In the following years closer relations were attempted and realised with the kindred unions at Hall, Cologne, Ingolstadt, Dillingen, Münster, and Lucerne. 'There was a mutual interchange of annual reports between them, and the separate unions were edified and strengthened by learning from different quarters of the constant progress of the common cause; communications of this sort were always read aloud at the different assemblies of the unions.' In all questions bearing on the Catholic cause the warmest interest was taken. At Innsbruck the members of the Congregation used to pray for the delivery of the unfortunate Scotch Queen, and for the victory of the Catholic cause in the Cologne episcopal dispute. How highly the work

of a first president of the Marian Congregation for burghers there. After his death, the Congregation, in a letter to the Trent sodality, described the labours and merits of the man who had belonged to them for fifty-four years. Guarinoni, they said, had indeed been much ridiculed because he received the Holy Sacraments so often, but this had only strengthened his zeal. 'He was also ardently devoted to the recitation of the Rosary. The forty days' fasts he observed faithfully up to his eighty-third year, the year of his death. When the plague was raging he shone forth as a radiant light of compassionate love, in fearlessness of death. To the memory of the great Charles Borromeo he erected a church at his own expense, and lent his personal services as mason in the work of building. For Father Canisius he had such deep reverence that year by year he commemorated the anniversary of his death with his whole household. Impelled by zeal for the salvation of souls, he wandered frequently over mountain and valley in order to expound the catechism to the children.' This letter is printed in the *Sendboten des Göttlichen Herzens Jesu*, Jahrg. 21 (Innsbruck, 1885), pp. 336–337; cf. Agricola, ii. 234–235; Kropf, iv. 160. Concerning Guarinoni, see also Hirn, i. 2, at the passages quoted in the Register, and also our remarks, vol. vi. 279 ff. (German), vol. vii. 353, 363–368, 428 (German).

of these unions was prized at Rome appears from the large money contributions, and the consecrated banners sent to them thence.[1]

In the episcopal towns where colleges were erected, the clerical seminaries were also mostly under the direction of the Fathers. In the people's schools also the latter became so actively influential, that the Protestants made the exaggerated statement that 'the Jesuits have in the Empire full three hundred schools of boys and girls, paupers and hand-workers, which they have in part erected themselves, and which are under their direction and management.'[2]

'The German College at Rome,' wrote a preacher in the year 1594, 'is a special nursery of Jesuitical instruction for Germany. German youths receive free education there, and are sent straight back to the Fatherland to work in bishoprics and parishes as prelates, episcopal councillors, and even as bishops, for the reinstitution of the papacy, and for its strong defence; and indeed we have many such Jesuit pupils in mind in many places who carry on their work with devoted zeal, and we evangelicals may well ask ourselves in what lands and in what towns such fervent zeal for the beloved Gospel is found among our own party. They draw so many people away from us that it is quite lamentable.'[3]

'If the Order of the Jesuits,' said Chemnitz, 'had

[1] Hirn, i. 274–275.

[2] *Nothgedrungene Erinnerungen* (see above, p. 311, note 2, Bl. 7). For the activity of the Jesuits in the people's schools and in Sunday schools, see for Treves, Zirngiebl, p. 310; for Landsberg, Lipowsky, *Gesch. der Schulen in Bayern* (Munich, 1825), p. 223, note 1; for Munich, Flotto, iii. 145, 447; for Augsburg, Agricola, ii. 50; for Biburg, Agricola, ii. 40. For the services of the Jesuits respecting the *Sonntags-Christenlehre*, see also the articles in the *Katholik*, 1888, ii. 306 ff.

[3] *Nothgedrungene Erinnerungen*, Bl. 8. See v. Wedel, p. 132.

done no more than found the German College, for this alone it would have earned the name of the destroyer of Lutheranism.' [1]

Under Pope Gregory XIII., in consequence of a memorandum sent in by Canisius, the German College obtained secure endowment for a definite number of pupils.[2] At least one hundred pupils—so a bull of August 6, 1573, decreed[3]—collected from all the different circles of the Empire, were to be maintained there and instructed in philosophy and theology. Gregory XIII. presented the College with the palace of St. Apollinarius, the monastery of St. Saba, and the revenues of St. Stephen on Monte Celio; besides which he referred them to the Apostolic treasury for the sum of 10,000 scudi. In 1574 the number of pupils rose to 130, and a few years later to 150. Three years was the allotted time for the study of philosophy, and four for that of theology.

The Pope erected colleges, on the model of the German College, at Braunsberg, Dillingen, Fulda, Prague, and Vienna, and endowed them with considerable sums of money. He was also a generous supporter of the German College at Rome: it has been calculated that in the period from October 15, 1573, to August 15, 1585, this institution received from Gregory XIII. no less than 235,649 scudi—*i.e.* nearly one million francs.[4]

Before long pupils from the German College were to be seen in nearly all the Catholic districts of Germany, working as missionaries, as spiritual counsellors to

[1] See Hurter, iii. 440–441.

[2] See Steinhuber, i. 89 ff., and our remarks vol. viii. 260-261, as also Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, xlii. ff. and *Nuntiaturberichte*, iii. 1, xxvii. ff.

[3] Steinhuber, i. 91.

[4] Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten*, xlviii.

bishops, as court preachers to princes: in many cases indeed they were actually themselves raised to the dignity of bishops and archbishops.

Even enemies of the Church recognised the beneficent influence which this institution exercised on the ecclesiastical nobles in the chapters.[1] Most of the canons of the German bishoprics had till then been 'merely distinguished secular lords with ecclesiastical titles, not priests by any means; they had not received ecclesiastical consecration, they were deficient in any sort of learning or culture, and their lives, far from being in any degree edifying, were thoroughly mundane, objectionable, and too often licentious in the extreme.' Canisius frequently made bitter complaints on this score. The immorality of the cathedral canons, who were chosen from the ranks of the badly brought-up German nobility, was known to all the world, he wrote to Francesco Borgia; they were military men, and they appeared to be even more given up to depravity than were other laymen; their conduct gave rise to universal scandal; and yet the preservation of the bishoprics depended on them: in Mayence, Cologne, Strasburg, Würzburg, there were numbers of canons who were not only under suspicion as regards the faith, but were even avowed heretics.[2] It was like a new era in Germany when 'from the German College, where by degrees a

[1] Cf. Lang, *Gesch. der Jesuiten in Bayern*, p. 210 ff.; Sugenheim, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*; i. 92. A list of the prominent pupils up to 1618 in the *Catalogus Coll. Germanici* (Romae, 1879), pp. 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 18, 20. From 1552–1798 the archbishopric of Cologne furnished 382 pupils to the college, that of Treves 148, and that of Mayence 287; the bishopric of Constance was represented then by 432 pupils, that of Trent by 290, that of Augsburg by 197, that of Münster by 184, that of Freising by 161, and so forth (*Catalogus*, pp. 22–26).

[2] Boero, *Canisio*, p. 314.

large number of nobles had received their education,[1] there issued forth bands of canons who had been scientifically trained, who wore clerical attire, who said the Holy Mass, who preached, who were active in the confessional, who visited the sick, and edified the people by priestly behaviour.

'The emissaries of the Jesuits sent forth from their Roman College,' a Protestant controversialist complained in 1593, 'resemble their Fathers in all diabolical cunning, in hypocritical piety, and in the idolatrous practices which they carry on so extensively among the people; they preach abundantly, as though they were Christians, they frequent hospitals and the sick in their homes, but it is all nothing but outward show and humbug by which the villains hope to reimpose the accursed papacy on the simple people.'[2]

Special witness of the zeal of the 'Germanikers' (fellow or student of the German College) came from the district of the Eichsfeld and the towns of Erfurt, Aschaffenburg, Mayence, Coblentz, Cologne, Treves, Münster, Würzburg, Spires, and others.[3] At Erfurt ruined priests incited the populace against the Germaniker Nicholas Elgard. 'I am surprised,' Elgard said in a letter to a Cardinal, 'that even one individual should have been

[1] Cordara, p. 26. Pupils of distinguished position were in special request, as they could exert greater influence in Germany; see the letter of the Cardinal of Como (November 27, 1573) to the Bishop of Augsburg in Theiner, *Annales*, i. 95.

[2] *Wölfe im Schafspeltz* ('Wolves in sheep's clothing'), Bl. 6.

[3] Cordara, pp. 110–117; Steinhuber, i. 189 ff.; Braun, *Heranbildung des Klerus*, p. 122 ff.; Richter, *Gesch. der Paderborner Jesuiten*, i. (Paderborn, 1892), p. 26; Knieb, *Gesch. der Reformation und Gegenreformation auf dem Eichsfelde*, pp. 103, 134, 146, 149, 150, 182, 191, note 210. Here we have the altogether best, authentic history of the recatholisation of this region. Concerning the '*Germaniker*' in the Tyrol, see Hirn, i. 217.

able to remain Catholic in these districts, for there are so few priests worthy of the priesthood.' [1]

But he persevered and obtained a rich harvest. On the Eichsfeld, where the Mayence Archbishop Daniel Brendel, claiming as territorial lord the right of reform, had been at work since 1574 restoring the Catholic worship, 'the work was especially toilsome' owing to the dearth of priests. It required no small amount of patience, Christopher Weilhammer wrote thence to his former associates in the College, to tramp about on Sundays and feast-days, in heat or cold, in wind, storm, and snow, to three or four different places in the day, without time for food, to preach oneself hoarse, and to be rewarded by jeers! 'May you in your peaceful ease strive after the attainment of the virtue of patience: at present you can scarcely know the meaning of the word.' 'Be thankful for the blessings you enjoy,' wrote another former pupil to his comrades; 'you are, as it were, dwellers in Paradise; had we here in Germany monasteries such as yours, where exercises of piety may be performed, our country would indeed be happy.' A third writer who 'had learnt in the College how to prepare for spiritual service'—that is to say, for contempt and persecution—admonished the Germanikers as follows: 'A hard task awaits you if your field of labour is to be in Germany, but also blessed consolation. One of our brethren, while carrying the Holy Sacrament to a sick person, was mortally wounded by a heavy stone thrown at him; but he is looking forward with a joyful heart to his release. Many others have laid down their lives in the service of the plague-patients. This is

[1] Cordara, p. 108.

verily fruit in Christ the Lord.' [1] At Duderstadt, where the opposition of the Protestants was especially strong, the Germaniker Weinreich nursed the plague-patients by day and night till he succumbed to the malady himself. Others then took his place. Owing chiefly to these unremitting exertions on behalf of the plague-stricken people, one town and six villages on the Eichsfeld were brought back to the Church.[2] 'The Jebusitical emissaries,' writes a Protestant preacher, 'go in and out of the cottages of the poor with bread and wine under their cloaks, as they may be seen in numbers on the Eichsfeld and in the Fulda district, and under such pretexts they introduce their misleading doctrines among the common people.' [3] At Duderstadt a burgher threw a stone at the Germaniker Herz while he was offering the Sacrifice of the Mass there. At Denne, where the Germaniker Lukas Maurer occupied the parsonage in place of the deposed preacher, the populace collected together, pillaged the house, wounded and drove out the priest.[4]

As did their pupils, so did the Jesuits themselves reap their richest harvests in the service of the sick, the prisoners, and the poor. 'When we minister to the helpless, the needy, those who are forsaken by all,' said Canisius, 'we minister, as the Gospel teaches us, to Christ Himself.' During a plague epidemic in Treves in the year 1564, six Fathers vied with each other by the sick-beds; and when, in 1567, the pestilence

[1] Quoted by Willemsen, *Erinnerungen an Rom*, pp. 22–24. See Cordara, p. 102.

[2] Cordara, pp. 104–107; Steinhuber, i. 200.

[3] *Wölfe im Schafspeltz*, Bl. 7.

[4] Heppe, *Restauration*, pp. 102–103.

raged with still greater fierceness, five of the Fathers fell victims to it, and two more in 1586.[1]

'While in the pestilence years of 1564 and 1589 most of the clergy of Innsbruck and Wilten took to flight, as did many other people, the Jesuits remained in the town and visited the suburbs in order to administer the consolations of religion to the victims of the plague: and they reaped glorious spiritual fruits, as their annual report records to their credit.'[2] During the plague at Cologne in 1605 eight Fathers and eight Brothers devoted themselves to the service of the sick; two Fathers and one Brother were overtaken by death in the middle of their labours of love.[3] 'During the plague,' says a chronicle of Hall, 'the Jesuits were specially devoted in administering help and comfort to the sick, and in the midst of these services three Fathers, one from Suabia and two from Bavaria, fell victims to their love of their fellow-creatures.'[4] At Constance at one time nine Fathers and six Brothers were active in the same service. Two of these Fathers had hurried over of their own accord from abroad. The first of these was James Stitz, who on the outbreak of the plague was at Horb in Suabia, and who wrote thence to the Rector of the College of Constance: 'If I could be in several places at once where the plague is raging, and if I could not only labour in the service of the poor plague-stricken people, but also die, this would be my greatest happiness. Be assured, most venerable Father, every kind of death, every danger that is presented to me, I regard as the highest privilege. For it belongs to our warrior

[1] Stramberg, *Metrop. Eccl. Trevir.* ii. 269; Alegambe, pp. 80, 85.
[2] Hirn, i, 233. [3] Reiffenberg, p. 416 ff.
[4] *Zum Jahre 1611* in Sinnacher, viii. 153.

service, it is incumbent on our Order, in no danger whatever to leave a neighbour in the lurch. To think otherwise, to act otherwise, would be contrary to the examples of our Fathers.' After twelve days of unremitting exertions for the spiritual and physical well-being of the plague patients, for whom he also collected food by begging, he fell as a Christian soldier. The second Father also, who died a victim to love of his neighbour, Kastulus Agricola, had begged to be allowed to come to Constance. 'How can it harm us,' he had written to the Rector of the College there, 'if in doing the will of God, in pure devotion, in the service of our neighbour, death should fall to our lot?'[1] Within less than a month this fate befell Father Christopher Gebhard and three Brothers. Inspired by their heroic examples, several burghers had also offered themselves to nurse the sick. 'Even the enemies of the Order who were in Constance,' wrote at the time the preacher Heinrich Lauber, 'cannot deny that when the infection was raging, when all the rest of the world was almost out of its senses with fear, the Jesuits showed themselves valiant succourers of the poor; and for this they deserve to be praised, however much they may otherwise be condemned.'[2]

The Jesuits came forward with like self-sacrificing devotion to help all the plague cases at Coblentz, Linz on the Rhine, Heiligenstadt, Worms, Würzburg, Vienna, Prague, Brünn, and other places. Up to the beginning of the Thirty Years' War the authorities mention, with accurate specification of name, place, and year of death, no less than 121 Jesuits, to whom 'it was allotted to meet their

[1] Letters of the year 1611 in Kropf, i. 6–8; Alegambe, pp. 166, 168.

[2] *Von Werken christlicher Barmherzigkeit* (1612), Bl. 9ᵇ.

deaths in the midst of dutiful service to the plague patients.' [1] Town councils and other secular corporations lauded the Fathers as 'indefatigable sick-nurses and benevolent Fathers of those in want and suffering, of whom,' said, for instance, the town council of Lucerne in 1597, 'we can never think without tears of gratitude in our eyes.' [2]

From Innsbruck, where on one occasion three Fathers—among them Caspar Melchior von Kestlarn—fell as sacrificial victims to the plague, the magistrate wrote to the Prince-Bishop of Brixen concerning Caspar: 'During the epidemic which raged fiercely here, he was a veritable fount of consolation to everyone with his spiritual fervour and his knightly loyal-hearted succour.' [3]

The Jesuits also bestowed their care on the poor and the prisoners, as well as on the plague patients; in times of war they served as missionaries in the field: in the Turkish wars especially, when they accompanied the armies. 'Everywhere,' their opponents remarked, 'the Jesuits know how to insinuate themselves. Just as in the pulpit they seduce the people to idolatry, in the schools offer up the poor young people to Moloch, in their writings deny Christ and incite to bloody intrigues, so they sneak round into houses, fasten themselves alike

[1] Exact details occur especially in Alegambe, in the *Provinz-Geschichten* of Agricola, Kropf, Flotto, Schmidl, Socher, and in the *Litterae annuae*, and they show that the zeal of the Jesuits was by no means confined to the first period of their activity, when it was important for them to establish a firm footing. Compare, for instance, the statements concerning Vienna for the years 1597, 1606, 1613, 1617, and 1618, in Alegambe, pp. 98, 232, 235; *Litterae annuae* of 1606, p. 466 sq., of 1613 and 1614, p. 11; Tanner, S.J., *Apostol. Imitatrix*, p. 448.

[2] *Giftige Anklagen wider den Order der Gesellschaft Jhesu* (1604), p. 9.

[3] April 8, 1612. Sinnacher, viii. 150, 152; cf. Kropf, i. 11.

on persons of distinction and people of low degree, give away bread and other food in order to gain the poor, attach themselves to gaolers and criminals, and pursue the same sort of arts in the military camps in order to bewitch the soldiers into believing their idolatrous nonsense; in short, wherever there is any prey to be had, there at every opportunity and in every kind of garb you will find the Jesuits.'[1] General Francis of Mendoza wrote in 1597 to the Bishop of Paderborn refuting the reports circulated about the Jesuits: 'The Fathers endeavour to suppress the cursing and swearing of the soldiers, and to restrain as much as possible the robbery and plunder that goes on; they prevent much crime by their exhortations, they visit the sick assiduously, give relief to the wounded, and by their supplicating entreaties they have often been the means of obtaining milder treatment for towns than they would otherwise have received at the hands of the incensed and furious soldiery.'[2]

In the year 1595 Canisius, in a letter from Freiburg in Switzerland, in which he called himself 'a useless old man of 74,' encouraged and incited the young German Jesuits to zealous devotion to the sick and wounded during the Turkish war. 'I rejoice,' he wrote on October 8 of the same year to his young brother Jesuit, Michel Eber at Dillingen, 'that our band of workers has arrived in good condition in Transylvania. They have a splendid opportunity there among the soldiers to practise, especially, the virtue of patience,

[1] *Wölfe im Schafspeltz*, Bl. 3.

[2] Strunck, iii. 602; Reiffenberg, p. 331. Concerning the labours of the Jesuits during the Turkish campaign of Archduke Matthias, see *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1601*, p. 685 sq.

whether with regard to food, sleeping accommodation, or hostelry. They are working day and night, not for themselves but for others. All their goods and chattels consist in what they carry with them. They never take any thought for the morrow. For the good that they do they oftentimes reap blame and abuse, and yet they never desist from showing kindness to their calumniators. Let us, then, take this thought to ourselves, that not in colleges only, but also in wars and on battle-fields, we may find schools of philosophy and of virtue. May we who are frequently enemies still to the Cross of Christ learn to love Christ Himself in these poor men. We shall consider it an inestimable benefit if we should be sent out to the poor soldiers, and given in sacrifice to the shooters and swordsmen of the Turks.' 'Unfortunately for me, it is not consistent with my age that I should be sent forth to labour for this wide, abundant harvest, and that I should join myself to our countrymen who are fighting in the Hungarian war.' The younger Jesuits, therefore, should, he said, devote themselves heartily to this work, and show in this way how profitable their long years of study had been to them.[1]

In the old Orders also there arose new life, stimulated and fostered chiefly by the unintermittent struggle against Protestantism. During the first decades of the Church schism the Dominicans and Franciscans were

[1] A copy of this letter is in the Jesuit College at Exacten. Infirm in body, Canisius desired at least to contribute a spiritual subsidy to the Turkish war. In 1596, just before his death, he published at Freiburg his *Kriegsleut Spiegel*, a popular biography of St. Mauritius and his associates, written to admonish 'all Christians, but especially generals, captains, officers, and common soldiers, to fight valiantly against all enemies of Christ.' Cf. Riess, pp. 487–488; de Backer, i. 1051; and Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus*. Nouv. édit. Bibliographie, ii. 681 (Paris, 1891).

the principal combatants of the innovations that were invading literary and scientific departments as well as religion. In the reform of the monasteries of Bavaria and Franconia the Dominican Felician Ninguarda, in the last quarter of the century, earned lasting honour as papal commissioner.[1] 'It is astonishing with what zeal the pious man threw himself into his task, what sacrifice of time, health, and comfort he brought to it. Accustomed to a brighter sky and warmer sunshine, he did not let the climate of the ungenial north in the least deter him from the pursuit of his aim. Not in summer only, but also in the most inclement winter weather, he went from bishopric to bishopric, from diocese to diocese.' Everywhere, in the midst of conditions of unexampled sadness, 'he interposed with a firm hand, reproving faults, issuing ordinances, punishing guilt, removing unworthy persons from their offices, and insisting on the execution of the reforms decreed at Trent.'[2] Ninguarda gained great renown in Bavaria,

[1] According to the catalogue in Quétif et Echard, *Scriptt. ord. Praedicatorum* (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1719–1721), tom. ii. 958–959, the Dominican Order, from the *début* of Luther to the beginning of the Thirty Years' War, counted, in Germany and in the Netherlands, thirty-five members who opposed the heretical doctrines by their writings. The catalogue is by no means complete. Among other omissions, for instance, is the name of the convert Bartholomew Kleindienst, whose pamphlet entitled '*Ermahnung an die lieben Deutschen*,' which appeared in 1560, is of great interest (cf. *Hist.-pol.* Bl. [1892], Bd. 109, pp. 485 ff., 493 ff.). In the same work, vol. cx., Heft, 1 and 2, see what is said concerning the Dominican Ambrosius Belargus and his labours. To complete this interesting article of N. Paulus, it ought to be noticed that A. Pelargus, according to the archives of the Dominican monastery of Frankfort, died July 5, 1561. See Koch, *Das Dominikanerkloster zu Frankfurt-am-Main* (Freiburg, 192), 124, 134.

[2] See the interesting and valuable article by Schlecht: 'F. Ninguarda and his inspectoral work in the Eichstatt districts,' in de Waals *Röm. Quartalschrift* (1891), v. 62 ff.; and in the same work, iv. 363 ff., what is

where a widespread development of new and vigorous religious life set in. The Jesuit schools were filled with members of different Orders: at Dillingen, for instance, their yearly number ranged not infrequently from 100 to 150.[1] In the year 1581 the abbots and provosts of the Bavarian Benedictines, Premonstratensians, Cistercians, and Augustinian Canons formed the resolution to found a central seminary for their Orders at Ingolstadt, in order to raise the standard of monastic discipline and learning; with the support of Duke William IV. the College was built.[2]

Among the Benedictines, who still retained their ardour for learned and scientific studies, the monastery of Ottobeuren in especial could boast of a great scholar in Nicholas Ellenbog, who had done distinguished service in many convent schools.[3] At Beneditbeuern, Father Florian Trefler († 1565) excelled as linguist and botanist as well as a defender of the old faith; his Latin lectures went through several reprints.[4] The Tegernsee Benedictine, Wolfgang Sedelius, a friend of Father Canisius, travelled all over the land, preaching and teaching.[5] At St. Blasius in the Black Forest the

said concerning the Bavarian Concordat of 1583 brought to a settlement by Ninguarda.

[1] See Flotto, i. 201, 385; *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1605*, p. 618.

[2] Mittermüller, pp. 140–141.

[3] Ziegelbauer, ii. 338–339; cf. L. Geiger, *N. Ellenbog, a humanist and theologian of the sixteenth century.* From MS. sources (Vienna, 1870).

[4] Ziegelbauer, iii. 353; Meichelbeck, i. 227–250; *Katholik*, 1892, i. 560 ff.

[5] Ziegelbauer, ii. 144. For the labours of the Benedictines in other monasteries see *loc. cit.* ii. 145, 146, and iv. 128. The Munich State Library has preserved many MS. sermons and treatises of W. Sedelius; see *Katholik*, 1892, i. 559; in the same place, information concerning other leading Benedictines of that time; *e.g.* p. 543 ff., concerning Nicholas Buchner, Abbot of Zwiefalten; p. 553, concerning Joh. Chrysost. Hirschbeck,

abbot Caspar Müller († 1571) restored monastic discipline, rebuilt the dilapidated hospital for the sick and poor, and laboured zealously to raise the standard both of the higher and the lower schools. From the year 1596 the abbot Martin Meister was the actual reformer of the school system. Not only was his own abbey-school exclusively filled with teachers from St. Blasius, but he was able also to send instructors to Schuttern, to Schwarzbach, and to other cloisters. When Archbishop Marx Sittich later on founded a university at Salzburg, he obtained five professors from St. Blasius; among these, the first rector of the institution, Martin Steinegg.[1] At Weingarten the abbots Gerwig Blarer of Wartensee, and Johannes Hablizel († 1575) distinguished themselves by their enthusiasm for the Church and for learning.[2] Einsiedeln also boasted a number of excellent abbots. When Canisius undertook in his old age to revive in popular writings the memory of the first Swiss messengers of the faith, he was supplied with literary materials from Einsiedeln.[3] At St. Gall the abbot Othmas († 1577) founded an infirmary and a fund for the poor. His successor, Joachim Opfer, who had been educated at a Jesuit school, could read and speak German, French,

Abbot of Scheyern. For the Abbot of the Alsatian Benedictine monastery of Murbach, Rudolf Stör, who was an ardent promoter of learning, and delighted in the society of scholars, see the excellent monograph of N. Paulus, *Der Augustinermönch Joh. Hoffmeister*, p. 117 ff. For Sedelius and Canisius, see also Braunsberger, ii. 17, 225, 402–403; see in the same place ii. 225, note 14, a beautiful testimony to the Franciscans of Munich.

[1] See König, 'St. Blasien,' an article in the second edition of the *Kirchenlexikon* of Weltzer and Welte, ii. 906–915.

[2] G. Hess, *Catalogus abbatum imp. monasterii Weingartensis* (Augustae Vindel. 1781), 219 sq., 282 sq.

[3] Chr. Hartmann, *Comment. rerum Helveticarum*, p. 53. In the *Stiftsbibl. zu Einsiedeln.*

Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and kept up correspondence with many learned men. At the time of the plague which broke out at St. Gall in 1594, the abbot with six other priests undertook the charge of the sick. He himself fell a victim. His successor, Bernard Müller, was remarkable for his rigid observance of monastic discipline and his care for the poor.[1] The Scotch monastery at Ratisbon acquired an admirable overseer in Ninian Winzet (1577–1592), who also raised the instruction of the young to fresh vigour and bloom.[2] The ancient venerable monastery of Metten had enjoyed since 1595 the benefit of the labours of the abbot Johann Nablas, a true ornament of the Order by reason of his enthusiasm for reform, and his love of learning and science.[3]

The decree of the Council of Trent that all monasteries which would not unite themselves together in a Congregation should no longer enjoy the privilege of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction was the cause of the formation of several Congregations among the Benedictine Order; among others, that of St. Joseph in the bishopric of Constance and the Swiss Congregation, which was founded by the abbot Augustine of Einsiedeln in 1602.[4] The Bursfeld Congregation elected as their president, in 1601, the learned bibliologist and Church apologist, Leonard Ruben, Abbot of

[1] Arx. St. Gall, iii. 111–122.

[2] Ziegelbauer, ii. 145, and iii. 360–361; cf. Bellesheim, *Gesch. der Katholischen Kirche in Schottland* (Mayence, 1883), ii. 21 ff., and *Hist. pol. Bl.* (1889), Bd. 103, p. 27 ff.; (1891), Bd. 107, p. 704 ff.

[3] Mittermüller, pp. 151–152.

[4] Cf. F. Egger, *Idea hierarch.* lib. ii. p. 3, 739. For the Reform labours in the Austrian monasteries, where the most hopeless conditions existed, I would refer especially to J. F. Keiblinger, *Gesch. des Benediktinerstiftes Melk in Niederösterreich*, Erster Band, 'Gesch. des Stiftes' (Vienna, 1851).

Abdingkosen, who worked in a variety of ways to rekindle the spirit which had shone in the founder of the Order.[1]

Among all the different Orders the Carthusians had kept themselves most free from the corruption of the times.[2]

In the Carthusian monasteries of Mayence and Hildesheim, for instance, the priors Kandius Gobelinus and Theodoric Loer ruled respectively with all the ancient severity; the latter published a large portion of the works of the famous Carthusian, Dionysius Rickel († 1471), and compiled his biography. In the Carthusian monasteries of Würzburg and Tückelhausen the monks Winheim Gerard and Braunold Lucas laboured as writers on Church matters. 'The most resplendent cornerstone of the Order'—as in the fifteenth century, so also in the stormy times of the sixteenth century—were the Carthusians at Cologne. Among all the monks of that city Johannes Justus Landsberger stood out as a shining example of high endeavours after Christian perfection. 'In him the utmost severity towards himself was coupled with the greatest tenderness and love to others, especially towards those who erred in the faith; for these he prayed unintermittently.' In his old age Canisius still entertained thoughts full of reverence for this exemplary man, and in his 'Spiritual Testament' he records with thankfulness the fact that during his residence at Cologne he was privileged to go in and out among the Carthusians. With a view to establishing Catholic doctrine, instructing the erring,

[1] Ziegelbauer, iii. 368–369.

[2] Nevertheless, it is shown by the rare document, *Orationes I. Hessi, prioris Carthusianae in Erphurdia*, p. 1, 1539, that many Carthusians embraced the new doctrines.

and strengthening those who were weak in the faith, Landsberger published twenty treatises in Latin, and seventeen in German: among the first-named a 'Guide to Piety' ('Anleitung zur Gottseligkeit'). He composed this work for the daily use of the Premonstratensian nuns at Hensberch, who understood Latin, and among whom ancient convent discipline still reigned.[1] In the Carthusian monastery at Cologne there lived also one who had been an intimate friend of Canisius in his youth, Father Laurenz Surius of Lübeck. Among the large number of works produced by this man that which specially pleased his contemporaries was an immense collection of the Lives of the Saints.[2]

The Cologne Carthusian prior, Gebhard Kalkbrenner, formerly advocate and notary at Aix-la-Chapelle, was an indefatigable patron of the Jesuits, and was honoured by Canisius as a Father.[3]

'What brings forth most fruit for the Church, and most incites to a serious spirit of penitence, is the witness of confessors and of martyrs who have sealed their faith with their blood. Thank God, the Church has still such Christian heroes to show in our days.' To the Cologne Carthusian monastery there came in 1572, terribly wounded in his head and in one arm, a Father from Ruremond, who was able to give information concerning the elaborate cruelty with which the soldiers

[1] Hartzheim, *Bibl. Colon.* pp. 183–184. See concerning Landsberger the *Mainzer Katholik* (1880), Bd. 60, 317 ff., and (1892) i. 554 ff.; see also Braunsberger, i. 37, note 1. The *Anleitung zur Gottseligkeit* was repeatedly reproduced in German translations, last of all at Ratisbon, 1875.

[2] A catalogue of the writings is given in Hartzheim, pp. 218–222. New edition of Surius, *Lives of the Saints*, 15 vols., Taurini, 1875–1880; see Litter, *Handweiser*, 1883, p. 501 ff.

[3] Hartzheim, p. 94; Reiffenberg, pp. 10, 24, 30–31; *Mantissa*, pp. 12–13, 15–16; cf. Riess, viii. 35–36, 51.

of the Prince of Orange had tortured and put to death twelve Carthusians of that place on July 23, besides mutilating several others.[1]

The Franciscan Order also, in like manner, 'fructified anew' by a long roll of martyrs, who had died for their faith during the Dutch revolution, after its return to a stricter rule of discipline, worked most beneficially for the revival of Catholic life. In the Cologne province of the Order the chief promoters of the education of the members of Orders, of the catechetical instruction of the young, and of people's missions were the provincials, Anton of Stralen († 1584), Johannes Hage († 1590), and Nicholas Viger.[2] Doctor Ludwig van Gennep, who had visited a large number of Franciscan monasteries on the Rhine, in Franconia, and in Bavaria, expressed, in 1595, the wish that 'the heretics might become convinced by personal observation of the injustice of their wholesale condemnation of the monasteries.' 'It is truly touching, and it reminds one of the best times of the Christian past,' he wrote, 'to see the lives and the labours of the Capuchins. I became acquainted with these friars in Switzerland and in the Tyrol: they are poor and lowly-minded and full of burning love for their fellow-creatures, just as Christ; their highest example, was Himself poor and lowly and full of love.'[3]

Bareheaded, wearing nothing but one coarse garment girt with a cord, and their feet shod only with sandals,

[1] Cf. Reichenlechner, *Der Kartäuserorden in Deutschland* (Würzburg, 1885), pp. 129–147, 213 ff.

[2] Gaudentius, i. 292–299, 303 ff.

[3] From Cleve, October 27, 1595, to the licentiate Reinhold Vanmeegen at Löwen. Konzept. From the bequest of the Canon of Xanten, Heinrich Eggers, in my (Ludwig Pastor's) possession.

the Capuchins, a branch of the family of St. Francis of Assisi,[1] went from place to place bent especially on preaching the Gospel to the lower orders. Their rule of fasting was rigorous in the extreme; they were forbidden to make any provision for food in their monasteries. They slept on straw, or on a blanket on the floor. According to the ancient custom of the Minorites they chanted Matins at midnight; their day's work was begun with prayer and continued on a minutely rigid routine for every hour. In their churches, as well as in their monasteries, evangelical poverty was always to be apparent. All church decorations in gold, silver, and silk were strictly forbidden: 'the sole wealth of the Order' was to consist in 'indomitable faith and trust in God, in devotion and self-surrender to the Holy Mother, the Church, and in the practice of every form of loving-kindness.' On their first appearance in Germany, and so long as the people remained ignorant of their rule of life, the Capuchins had often to struggle with extreme want of food: at Lucerne, for instance, where the Jesuits were obliged to exhort the burghers not to leave the hungry monks to starve.[2] But before long, in every place where they displayed their activity in preaching, in the confessional, in the care of the sick—above all their heroism in times of infectious epidemics—they became popular, and they received also frequent additions to their numbers from the learned and the upper classes. Among the 'most learned of the Brothers' was St. Fidelis, Doctor Markus

[1] See, concerning these monks, Gaudentius, i. 275, note, and Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Kathol. Kirche*, i. 315 ff. (Paderborn, 1896).

[2] Agricola, i. 261.

Roy from Sigmaringen, who had studied jurisprudence at the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau, and on leaving had received from the Rector the testimony that 'he excelled all his comrades in the University as much in virtue as in scholarly acquirements.' On leaving the University he became an attorney at Ensisheim, and after joining the Capuchin Order he served as an indefatigable missionary in Vorarlberg and in the Grisons until he died a martyr's death.[1]

'With no pretensions to learning, but, in his child-like piety and Christian love, a splendid example to the Order and to the people,' was Father Johannes of Chrysostom (a son of Edlen Schenk of Castell), who took the habit of the Order at Rheinfelden in 1601. He would not pursue the more advanced studies in philosophy and theology, so as to avoid being appointed to official posts in the Order, but all the same he was nominated Master of the Novices by the heads of the Order, in order that by his fervent spirit of love 'he might train up genuine sons of the holy Francis, the seraphic Father, whose chief aim in life had been to exhibit Christlike poverty and self-sacrifice, humility, and purity of heart, obedience and zeal in prayer, and who had prescribed these virtues in the rules of his Order.' The hymns composed by the Master of Novices are redolent of intense joy in believing and show the spirit in which he worked.[2]

[1] Schnell, *Dr. Markus Roy* (Freiburg, 1877), and the excellent monograph of P. Ferdinand della Scala (Mayence, 1896). See my (Ludwig Pastor's) recension in the *Zeitschr, für Kathol. Theol.* (1898), p. 147 ff.

[2] Ilg, pp. 247-267. In one of these hymns he says:

When fear and anguish oftentimes
Plague me for my sins and crimes
Which are so numberless and great,
They make me well-nigh desperate;

The first field of labour of the Capuchins was Altorf in Switzerland in the year 1581. In the following years they established secure settlements successively, at Stans in 1582, at Lucerne in 1583, at Schwyz in 1585, at Appenzell and Solothurn in 1587.[1] Their most zealous mission-preacher was Father Ludwig of Saxony, a convert from the Saxon house of Einsiedeln. As an arrogant student he had once showered ridicule on the procession of the Passion on Good Friday, and his desire now was 'in expiation of this sin to spend his whole life long in preaching and teaching about the passion and death of the Lord.'[2] Among the Capuchins there were some who 'mounted the pulpit many thousand times.' Father Philip, the son of the converted bailiff Conrad Tanner at Appenzell, preached over 7,000 sermons in Switzerland.[3] Within fourteen years ten monasteries and three mission stations were established there.[4]

From the Swiss province the Order extended itself into Alsace[5] and Vorarlberg,[6] from the Venetian

Upon the Holy Infant then,
And on His love, I meditate;
And all my terrors vanish when
My body and my soul
To Him I dedicate.
For if I'm His, and His alone,
He will not me disown—
He who so benignly saith:
'I do not will the sinner's death.'

[1] *Chronica Capucinorum*, pp. 6–21.

[2] This is how he spoke of Ludwig van Gennep; see above, p. 340, note 3.

[3] Ilg, pp. 14–15. [4] *Chronica*, p. 36.

[5] N. Paulus, *Zur Gesch. der Kapuziner im Elsass, in der archivalischen Beilage zum Strassburger Diözesanblatt* (Strassburg, 1889), p. 13 ff., and Gratian von Linden, *Die Kapuziner im Elsass einst und jetzt*, p. 53 ff. (Freiburg, 1890).

[6] The foundation-stone of the monastery at Feldkirch was already laid in 1601; the church was consecrated in 1605; see Sinnacher, *Die Einführung der Kapuziner*, p. 40.

province into the Tyrol, and thence into Styria. At Innsbruck in 1593 the Archduke Ferdinand and his wife took stones in their own hands for the building of the monastery there, and at the ceremony of handing over the keys to the guardian the Archduke delivered an address which moved all present to tears.[1]

Capuchin monasteries soon sprang up in Bozen, Brixen, and Meran, where the work was abundantly fruitful and blessed.[2] It was as if 'in a time of terrible extremity and widespread moral degradation,' wrote the physician Guarinoni, 'a new spirit had come down to earth and filled mankind with holy zeal for the salvation of souls.' A grey-headed Capuchin, giving an account of the strong revival which he had witnessed after the close of the century, says amongst other things: 'The work in the Tyrolese province expanded daily to such an extent, and so many well-born youths solicited admission to our Order, that it became necessary to establish a second novitiate at Innsbruck.' But, notwithstanding this measure, it was impossible to respond to the solicitations of the large number of pious candidates, and many of them were obliged to address themselves to some outside province. At the monastery of Hall the novice Cäsarius of Spires, son of a councillor in the Imperial Chamber, distinguished himself 'by his efforts after intellectual and physical mortification,

[1] Ilg, p. 22; Sinnacher, *Die Einführung der Kapuziner*, p. 24; Hirn, i. 253; M. Hetzenauer, *Das Kapuzinerkloster zu Innsbruck* (Innsbruck, 1893). A special patron of the Innsbruck Capuchins was Archduke Maximilian (†1618), who used to go into retreat every year for a certain period at the hermitage which he had built for himself in the monastery of Innsbruck. This hermitage is still extant; see M. Hetzenauer, *Die Eremitage Maximilians des Deutschmeisters*, from records in the archives (Innsbruck, 1894).

[2] Sinnacher, pp. 29 ff., 31 ff., 42 ff.

and it was no slight thing to excel in his novitiate, where the passion for mortification of the flesh was so intense that, to take one example only, sixteen of the novices of the Order, together with their master and some of the professed friars, used to mix their daily beverage with wormwood, in reference to the last drink given to the Saviour.' That 'the world thought this sort of thing very eccentric was not to be wondered at, but the stern spirit of penitence and the self-renunciation of the monks who day and night were at any and every one's service, aroused the spirit of repentance in the people, and among the secular priests, who were often more demoralised than the people.' 'The confessionals,' wrote Louis van Gennep, 'are simply besieged during the popular missions of the Capuchins; property unjustly acquired is restored, conjugal peace is re-established.'[1] Concerning Father Ludwig of Saxony, who had wonderful success in Graz also as a mission-preacher, another contemporary writes: 'Often and often he was compelled to stop in the middle of a public thoroughfare, under the open sky, to hear the confession of some unhappy sinner. For the people pressed around him as round an apostolic oracle; and not the people only, but princes and lords as well solicited his advice and longed to hear his sermons. With what indefatigable ardour this great man worked in the vineyard of the Lord is attested from Augsburg and other places, where multitudes were reclaimed by him from the errors into which they had sunk, and brought back to the bosom of the Mother Church. Similar testimony is given by numbers of monasteries and

[1] See above, p. 341, note 2.

nunneries which he reformed and restored to a stricter rule.' [1]

At Graz the mission labours of the Capuchins had begun in 1600, and in the same year also at Vienna, Prague, and Munich; [2] in the following year the Fuggers had built them a monastery at Augsburg. In the year 1602 they came to Rapperswyl, in 1603 to Constance and Ensisheim, in 1604 to Sursee, in 1606 to Rosenheim, and in the course of the following decade to Landshut, Neuburg, Ratisbon, Straubing, Biberach and Rottenburg on the Neckar; in this last town they won over nearly 250 Protestants to the Catholic faith.[3] The news of the conversion of many thousands in the Canton of Geneva and in the Wallis [4] fired the missionary zeal of the members of the Order in the Empire. 'Untroubled by the threats and the violences of the heretics,' wrote a Constance Capuchin in 1612, 'we go straight on doing our duty by preaching and giving Christian instruction, and by insistent and unremitting exhortations to wanderers to return to the bosom of the true Church.

[1] Ilg, pp. 290 ff. 23–26.

[2] This extensive spread of the Order was in great measure the work of St. Laurentius of Brindisi (1559–1619), who, conformably to a decree of the chapter-general of 1599, went himself across the Alps. Not less significant was the holy monk's share in the struggle against the Turks. The splendid victory at Stuhlweissenburg on October 11, 1601, and the glorious battle at Tzhokaki on October 14 of the same year were decided by the interposition of this new Kapistrano. See Gerardo da Radkersburgo, *Vita del b. Lorenzo da Brindisi*, Roma, 1783, and *Die Monographien von L. v. d. Schulenberg* (Mayence, 1863), and N. Stock (Brixen, 1882); see also Wetzer and Wette's *Kirchenlexikon*, ii. *s.v.* Laurentius v. Brindisi, and Schindler in the Linz *Quartalschr.* 1882, p. 238 ff.; 479 ff.

[3] *Chronica*, pp. 39 ff., 64; Pöckl, *Die Kapuziner in Bayern* (Sulzbach, 1826); see also the important work compiled from numerous contributions from unprinted documents, *Storia delle missioni dei Cappucini* (Parigi, 1867), p. 329 sqq. by Rocco da Cesinale.

[4] See Ilg, pp. 44–94.

May it be granted to all of us to labour with the same unintermittent joyousness as did our Brethren in Switzerland, who welcomed death for Christ's sake during the infectious plague.' [1] In Switzerland, in the years 1610–1611, thirteen members of the Order had died in the service of the plague-patients.[2]

The Capuchin monks worked hand in hand with the Jesuits, animated by the same enthusiasm for the salvation of souls; between the two Orders brotherly relations were kept up uninterruptedly, and they frequently coalesced in holding popular missions, which were regarded as one of the most powerful means for the revival of Christian life among the people. Father Canisius, who often participated in these missions, wished to see them confined to Catholic districts. In a memorandum drawn up between 1581 and 1597 for the General of the Order, Claudius Aquaviva, he said he did not deem it advisable that missionaries should be sent to districts which were under Protestant authority; for thereby 'a handle would be given to the heretics for complaining that the Jesuits wished to set aside the Religious Peace, and to intrude with their sickle into a foreign harvest-field.' [3]

[1] *Miscellaneen vermischten Inhalts*, pp. 113–114.

[2] *Chronica*, pp. 54, 56–57.

[3] '. . . Caeterum ut ipsi vel excurrant vel mittantur ad ea loca, quae ab haereticis magistratibus gubernantur, non suaserim. Quid enim nisi crabrones irritabunt, et se velut in aliena Republica curiosos, immo et seditiosos, aut certe quidem suspectos declarabunt, daturi etiam ansam haereticis nostros accusandi, quod pacem religionis ab Imperio sancitam violent, falcemque mittant suam in messem alienam' (in the archives of the German Province at Exacten).

CHAPTER XVIII

TERRITORIES BROUGHT BACK TO THE OLD FAITH

WHILE the revival of Catholic life had been proceeding thus briskly in the territories under Catholic dominion, the rulers themselves, during the last third of the century, had been opposing active resistance to the ecclesiastical innovations that had gained ground. The more the princes came to realise their duty to the Church founded by Christ, the more zealous were they in holding their subjects to the old faith. In this respect they too had the support of the Augsburg Confession, and could also appeal to the procedure of the Protestant princes and magistrates who would not tolerate any Catholic rites in their domains and jurisdictions.[1] In the work of Catholic restoration the Jesuits everywhere displayed ardent activity. Indeed, a large share of the work was due to princes, both secular and spiritual, who had been educated in the Jesuit schools.

In Lower Germany it was above all essential to re-establish the Catholic faith firmly in the duchy of Jülich-Cleves-Berg. Duke William IV. had pledged himself by oath to the Emperor Charles V., in the Treaty of Venloo, to maintain the Catholic religion in his lands; nevertheless, he swung backwards and forwards in his views like a pendulum, now attending Mass, now declaring that 'what the priest elevated in

[1] See our remarks, vol. v. p. 495 ff.

the Mass was of the devil;' now attracting the praise of the Apostolic See for 'his unusual zeal for the Church;' now giving the Protestant Estates ground for hope that he would publicly adopt the Confession of Augsburg.[1]

Among his councillors there were men of all creeds—strict papists, Lutherans, Calvinists, Erasmians. His wife, a sister of the Emperor Maximilian, had her daughter brought up in the Lutheran faith; the two sons, on the other hand, were under the spiritual guidance of a Catholic tutor. In the year 1551 the Duke forbade the exercise of all foreign spiritual jurisdiction under pain of death. At Duisburg and in other towns of the duchy sacks were hung up at the city gates, and anyone who violated this command by the proclamation of ecclesiastical decrees and letters of excommunication was put into a sack and thrown into the water. At Wesel, long before this, an order had already been issued that 'All who proclaim indulgences shall have their noses and ears chopped off.'[2] In the county of Mark especially, the number of Protestants had increased from year to year, and since the insurrection in the Netherlands, and the rule of Duke Alva, the Dutch refugees had almost everywhere taken an active part in the remodelling of ecclesiastical conditions. In 1568 a Calvinistic synod was held at Wesel, and the decrees of the meeting were signed by 62 persons—preachers, nobles, elders of congregations, and burghers.[3] 'If we could only get rid

[1] Keller, *Gegenreformation*, i. 5 ff. 25; cf. with Keller's work the article 'Zur Kirchengesch. der clevischen Länder' in the Mayence *Katholik*, *Dezemberheft* 1883 and *Januarheft* 1884. See also Koch, *Die Reformation im Herzogtum Jülich* (Frankfort-on-the-Main 1883 and 1888), 14 ff. and 76 ff.

[2] Recklinghausen, i. 51; iii. 89.

[3] Keller, i. 31 ff.

of the Jesuitical rabble,' said a prominent Wesel Calvinist in the following year, 'the duchy would soon become a stronghold of the true evangel, and popish idolatry would be completely rooted out.' 'I heard this remark,' wrote the physician Wilhelm Peters from Emmerich, 'with my own ears.'[1] But in 1562 the reformed preacher Johannes Pollius already complained of the successful work of the Jesuits in the duchy of Cleves: 'the Jesuit sect,' he said, 'with their semblance of unusual piety, and their distinguished and varied scholarship, are very dangerous to the inexperienced and the unguarded.' Among the Jesuits there was one who stood out, as it were, as a prince, 'a certain Dionysius, nephew of the great Canisius, who, by a great show of faked piety, and by unholy zeal in preaching, blinded the eyes of multitudes; the major part of the town councillors were completely in his power; they had adopted his heresies, and followed him blindfold.'[2] The preaching of the Jesuits 'gained powerful support from the iconoclastic riots which were inaugurated, after the pattern set in the Netherlands, in several small towns and villages of the duchy; for through these abominations the eyes of the people were opened to know what they had to expect from the sectaries.' 'I myself,' we read in a letter of the medical doctor Wilhelm Peters, 'have seen the way in which, under the lead of preachers and other fanatics from the Netherlands, the images and altars have in many places been pulled down, and the tabernacles destroyed. I have

[1] Letter of March 19, 1569, in a convolut: *Einige Stücke aus Akten zur clevischen Kirchenhistorie bis 1610*, from the bequest of the Xanten Canon, Heinrich Eggers, in my (Ludwig Pastor's) possession.

[2] *Zeitschr. des bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, ix. 171–172. For Heinrich Dionysius, S.J., see also Braunsberger, iii. 815; cf. p. 799.

seen the sacred Hosts trampled under foot. 'When the fanatics are reinforced by the populace, there is an end of all Catholic worship, for they will not tolerate anyone near them who is not of their party.' 'All this enhances the esteem of the Jesuits who trudge hither and thither through the land, and distinguish themselves by their exemplary piety.' [1] At the court of Cleves the Catholic party was gaining strength. Conrad Heresbach, the former preceptor of the Duke, and for more than forty years the most influential personage at the court, became reconciled to the Church in 1574.[2] Several years before this the Duke had already shown himself in the character of a Catholic, both by attendance at Mass and by receiving the Communion in one kind, and also by various decrees enacted for the maintenance of Catholic worship. When, in 1573, the nuncio Caspar Gropper, by order of Gregory XIII., required the institution of regular Church visitations, and the appointment of Catholic teachers in the schools, he found a ready hearing among the ducal councillors: the Catholics hoped that 'the old religion would soon again be regarded in the whole country as the only legal one.' [3]

The revolution at the Clevish court threw the Protestant princes into violent agitation. In May 1575 there appeared there a Palatine-Hessian-Brunswick embassy, bringing to the Duke the condolences of their

[1] Letter of August 17, 1568. See the statement of the nuncio Gropper concerning the tearing down of altars and the breaking up of images and pictures, in Büderich, Keller, i. 198.

[2] Keller, i. 60, 215, No. 174. Heresbach, who, although a provost and a canon, had married, begged for and obtained absolution from the Pope.

[3] Keller, i. 172, 178, 186, 196 ff., 207, 218, No. 179. Letter of the physician Wilhelm Peters, of May 3, 1575. Alva praised the Duke as early as April 30, 1570, because he had completely returned to the Church. Gachard, *Correspondance de Philippe II.*, tom. ii. 130.

princes on the death at Rome of the hereditary prince Charles Frederic.[1] From this death—so ran the message—the Duke might learn that there was neither good fortune nor salvation to be found in the papacy, or among its cardinals and legates. Formerly the Duke had been inclined to the Augsburg Confession, he had had his children educated in the acknowledged Christian truth, he had married his daughters to evangelical princes, he had allowed his subjects free exercise of their religion. The princes cherished the hope that he would not allow himself to be turned away from this Christian state of mind, and they assured him that if he 'should need their help for the work of Christian reform,' they would give him 'practical support.' If, however, he did not continue in his former Christian opinions, but allowed intriguing, peace-disturbing councillors to govern in his place, such a course would occasion much unpleasant suspicion among the evangelical princes, and provoke a great deal of ill-will, contrariety, and scandal among his subjects. According to the reports which they received from the Duke's subjects, it was to be feared that 'no good would follow' from a further prohibition of the Augsburg Confession.[2] Delegates

[1] For the illness and death of the hereditary Prince of Cleves (†February 9, 1575), who had been treated with great distinction at the papal court, see Lossen, *Kölnischer Krieg*, pp. 261–265, and Pighius, *Hercules prodicius* (Antwerpiae, 1587), p. 543 sqq., and Mac Swiney de Mashanaglass, *L'Epée et le Chapeau ducal donnés par Grégoire XIII. en 1575 à Charles Frédéric, prince de Clève et Juliers* (Rome, 1900).

[2] Keller, i. 227–230. The princes in their instructions for their ambassadors actually said that the Duke had incurred God's punishment in his own flesh and blood for his apostasy from the Augsburg Confession, no less than Pharaoh in Egypt in the slaying of the first-born. The ambassadors softened down this and other passages of their instructions, but, in spite of such modifications, says Lossen, *Kölnischer Krieg*, p. 274, 'their solicitations remained a piece of unheard-of tactlessness—yea, of downright impudence.'

from 'the poor oppressed Christians' of the Augsburg Confession had in fact complained in a petition to the ambassadors that, under threat of all sorts of severity, orders had been issued that everyone was to keep to his own parish church and his own Catholic pastor; that the preachers, who had now and again proclaimed the pure Gospel in the principalities of Jülich and Berg, had been removed, and that in many places in the duchy of Cleves Mass-priests had been appointed; in the town of Jülich the dean had ordered the followers of the pure doctrine to appear before him, and they had had to leave the town with their wives and children 'because they would not agree to his idolatry.' The ambassadors concluded from this petition that, 'if prohibition of the Word of God was continued, a rising of the people was to be feared.' [1]

To the message of the embassy the Duke answered that 'he had never shown himself opposed to the Augsburg Confession, that in his opinion the majority of its articles were in harmony with the Divine Word, with the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures, and with the ancient Councils, but that he had never accepted the Creed in all its points. He considered a Christian reform necessary, seeing that a certain number of abuses had been introduced into religion, and it had been his wish that the Emperor and the Estates might come to unanimity on this matter: instead of this, however, schism had arisen; the Augsburg Confessionists, moreover, were themselves not unanimous, but one section of them was inclined to Calvinism, another to Zwinglianism, and a third to Anabaptism. He had been unable to tolerate any longer that unlearned pastors

[1] Keller, i. 226-227, 235.

and others should introduce misunderstandings through sheer ignorance, and for this reason he had deposed some of the clergy, and had referred his subjects to ordinances enacted thirteen and fourteen years ago. All who refused to conform to these decrees must 'leave the land and sell their goods and chattels.' In thus acting he was keeping to the terms of the Religious Peace, and he could not allow himself to be deterred from this course; he hoped that the princes would not presume to set bounds to him in religious matters any more than he on his part did to his friends. The death of his son was certainly a divine visitation; but other princes also, such as those of Saxony and Würtemberg, had lately lost sons who were in the prime of life, and yet these princes had never gone over to Rome. With regard, however, to the threatened rebellion of the subjects, he hoped the latter would not be so shameless as to refuse obedience to their rulers; still, if such a contingency should occur, he counted on the support of the princes. The ducal councillors also intimated to the ambassadors that they were not aware that the Duke was violating the Religious Peace: this treaty related solely to the electors, princes, and Estates of the Empire whom it was intended to protect from oppression on account of religion; it had nothing to do with the subjects. The ambassadors, on the other hand, in direct contradiction of all that was going on in Protestant territories, alleged that this Peace granted the subjects also free exercise of their religion: that this followed 'from the letter of the treaty, and also from the circumstances of its origin.' [1] The embassy led to no good result; on the contrary, the Duke, who

[1] Keller, pp. 230–233; cf. Lossen, pp. 274–275.

had been for a long time already in failing health, and a prey to constant attacks of cramp, 'was completely incensed and embittered' because 'they had attempted to dictate to him in his government.' He should now, he declared, 'proceed all the more doggedly in enforcing his own will.'[1] He resolved to use coercion in bringing over his sister Amelia and his two still unmarried daughters to the Catholic faith. Count Hermann of Neuenar reports that 'one day the Duke pursued his sister through the galleries of the castle of Hambach with a naked rapier, because she would not submit to his will, and that, if a good angel of a man had not opportunely closed a door between them, his princely grace would have stabbed his sister.'[2]

Again and again the Protestant members of the provincial Estates had demanded 'freedom of the Augsburg Confession;' but whereas, under the cloak of this creed, sects of all sorts—'Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and others'—became more and more widely disseminated through the land,[3] the government had always refused to comply with the demand. The Duke assured the nuncio Gropper in 1578 that 'he should not let himself be prevailed on to agree to the proposals of certain of his subjects for freedom of the Augsburg Confession.' The Estates were informed that 'the Duke had so far never tyrannised over the conscience of any adherent of this Confession, but the public exercise of it he could not sanction. The letter of the Religious Peace expressly stated that it was free and optional to the Estates of the Empire to adopt and exercise

[1] Despatch of Wilhelm Peters of September 21, 1575: see above, p. 350, note 1.

[2] Keller, i. 240; cf. pp. 64–69.

[3] Cf. the edicts from June to August 1576, in Keller, i. 247.

the Augsburg Confession, but not so to the towns, parishes, and subjects of each Estate: if the subjects were not satisfied with the religion of their rulers, they were free, according to the terms of the Peace, to remove to other localities with their wives and children, and their goods and chattels.'[1] In 1583 the ducal councillors again drew attention to the fact that the Protestant subjects enjoyed much greater freedom in the duchies than they did elsewhere, for it was only the public exercise of their faith that was forbidden them; to allow them public profession and exercise would be equal to handing over entire dominion to them, for when once they were in possession of this freedom, they would tolerate no other religion near them, and 'the Catholics would then be expelled.' For the justice of this statement the councillors said 'they could refer not only to the neighbouring Netherlands, but to plenty of examples also in all parts of the Empire.'[2] In February 1584 the Duke issued an address to the judges of the principal towns of the duchy of Cleves to the effect that 'the report circulated by certain turbulent agitators that, at the last provincial diet at Dinslaken, the preaching of the new doctrine had been sanctioned, was untrue.' On the contrary, the Duke had declared emphatically that he could not consent to the innovations. All secret meetings of the sectarians were to be prohibited, and money fines fixed by him were to be levied on the trangressors.[3]

The Duke's younger son, John William, formerly elected to the bishopric of Münster, was recalled to

[1] Keller, i. 257–258.

[2] Keller, i. 263; Wilhelm Peters, October 2, 1583: see above, page 350, note 1.

[3] Keller, i. 266.

the duchy of Cleves, after the death of his brother Charles Frederic, as hereditary prince of the land. In 1585 he married Jacobe of Baden-Baden, who had been educated at the Bavarian court, and 'he showed himself' —so the Calvinists complained—'of a thoroughly Jesuitical mind, and heartily devoted to all idolatrous, popish ceremonies.' Again and again the Protestant provincial deputies raised the demand for freedom of public worship; but it was never granted.[1] But 'by means of secret meetings and secret preachers, and with the help of the States-General, Calvinism gained a powerful following, notwithstanding that the larger portion of the people remained true to the Catholic faith.'[2]

When in 1593 a Jesuit school was opened at Emmerich, Dutch troops stationed themselves in front of the town and demanded, under threat of a bombardment, the expulsion of the Fathers and the reinstatement of a reformed preacher who had been ejected for stirring up the people against the Jesuits. The town was obliged to pay a large indemnity in order to make the troops withdraw.[3] When the school was opened 140 pupils presented themselves for admission; in 1598 the number amounted to 340; in 1606 to more than 400; Protestant parents also entrusted their children to the Jesuits for education.[4]

In the duchy of Westphalia, belonging to the Electorate of Cologne, after the defeat of Gebhard Truchsess,[5]

[1] Stieve, *Jakobe von Jülich*, p. 10 ff. See also Keller in Sybel's *Hist. Zeitschr.* 1889, pp. 63, 214, and Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 11 ff., 25 ff.

[2] Wilhelm Peters, March 2, 1595, to Pastor Rader at Löwen. See above, p. 350, note 1. See also *Hist. Jahrb.* xix. 792.

[3] See above, p. 237. Köhler, *Entwickelung des höheren Schulwesens in Emmerich* (Emmerich, 1882), pp. 50–51; Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 42.

[4] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1606*, p. 454; see Köhler, p. 52.

[5] See above, pp. 87-90.

both the Catholic religion and 'secular government, according to ancient tradition,' were restored under the Elector Ernest of Bavaria. The Catholic clergy who had been expelled by Gebhard returned to their posts, and from the year 1585 individual Jesuits worked as missionaries to the people in the towns and villages. The diocese of Münster had been for ten years the scene of a bitter contention as to whether a Catholic or a Protestant bishop should be elected its head. In 1585 the Catholic party triumphed,[1] and after this the Jesuits 'accomplished here also such extraordinary results in a short time, that the Catholics felt they could never sufficiently repay the debt of gratitude they owed them.' 'How zealously did the Jesuits bestir themselves in the land of Münster,' wrote a Protestant controversialist in 1593, 'preaching and teaching all day and every day without intermission, wherever the way was open to them, and restoring popery among the people.'[2] In 1588 a Jesuit college was founded at Münster, and the gymnasium connected with it numbered at the outset 300 pupils; in 1592 there were already over 1,100, and shortly before the beginning of the Thirty Years' War the number was usually over 1,300.[3]

The greatest difficulties in restoring Catholicism were met with in the diocese of Paderborn. When in 1580, in the lifetime still of the Protestant Bishop Henry of Sachsen-Lauenburg, the Jesuits came to Paderborn at the request of the cathedral chapter,[4] they

[1] Fuller details in Hüsing, pp. 62–146; Keller, i. 295–342.

[2] See above, p. 326, note 2.

[3] Sökeland, *Gesch. des Gymnasiums zu Münster*, pp. 62, 65, 69; Zirngiebl, pp. 314–315; Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 268 ff., 277 ff.

[4] Letter of the Chapter, February 10, 1580, to the Rector of the Jesuits at Fulda (Strunck, iii. 463).

experienced the deepest mistrust and the grimmest hatred from the Protestant burghers. It was only by the utmost care and prudence that they could escape personal maltreatment : such numerous calumnies had been circulated concerning them that 'among the people it was seriously believed that they had cloven feet like goats.'[1] Their first sermons were very poorly attended; even at the Christmas festival only twelve people received the Holy Communion.[2] After eight years of work and ministration the number of communicants increased to 750.[3] It was a momentous event when, in the year 1585, the municipal gymnasium was made over to the Jesuits; this school, which opened with 140 pupils, in the following year numbered nearly 400.[4] The influence of the new institution was as important as it was beneficial. From within its walls there came forth bands of 'regular clergy of strong moral character, zealous secular priests, men of every vocation in life, who not only held firmly to the old faith, but who were also well qualified to defend it by

[1] 'I have often heard this stated with my own ears,' writes in 1585 Karl Haber in the preface to his *Kurze Auslegung der heiligen Messe* (see Strunck, iii. 521 ff.). 'The Jesuits came also to Corvey. . . . As it was just the time of the annual market there was a great concourse of people; they flocked from Hesse, from Brunswick, and from Lippe in order to see and to hear a Jesuit, and there were about fifty Protestant preachers present, whom one could easily know from their clothes. But the Jesuit preached so morally that a superintendent said "that could be no true Jesuit, for he knew for a certainty that the Jesuits preached different doctrine from what was in the Holy Scriptures" ' (v. Löher, p. 42; see Reiffenberg, p. 184).

[2] Strunck, iii. 464.

[3] 'Octennali sudore,' says Strunck, iii. 538.

[4] Reiffenberg, p. 237; *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1586–87*, p. 294. 'Unique of its kind seemed the great love and solicitude' which the Jesuits 'devoted to their pupils. They saw in them vessels of divine grace and destination; they struggled for them as a father for his sons; they sought out the

word and by writing.' [1] One great patron of the Jesuits was the Prince-Bishop Theodore of Fürstenberg, who was elected in 1585, after the death of Henry of Sachsen-Lauenburg, and who worked with the utmost zeal for the restoration of the Catholic faith. The Protestant town council forbade, under heavy punishment, attendance at the preaching of the Jesuits, but the latter, by their active Christian love, gained more and more followers. When the plague broke out at Paderborn in 1598 the cathedral canons fled away, while the Jesuits, on the contrary, stuck to the bedsides of the sick, and administered to the poor creatures the loving services of compassionate brothers. They devoted themselves with especial tenderness to the lepers, who were huddled together in the hospital house, a mile outside the town, forsaken by all the world.[2] 'By such works as these they turned the hearts of many evangelicals to the idolatrous papacy:' the burghers who had opposed the erection of a Jesuit college withdrew their opposition. 'By the providence of God,' Fürstenberg said in a document relative to this college, 'he had been called to re-establish the Catholic Church in this part of Westphalia as it were from the foundations, and even before he had become a bishop he had recognised that none were better fitted to help in the task than the Order of the Jesuits:' this was a work of Divine Providence.[3] In the year 1604 the

wanderers and brought them home, as the good shepherd carries the lamb tenderly in his bosom' (v. Löher, pp. 93–94). See Keller, *Gegenreformation*, ii. 424 ff., and W. Richter, *Gesch. der Paderborner Jesuiten*, Erster Theil, 1580–1618 (Paderborn, 1892).

[1] Richter in the letter mentioned at note 5, p. 37.

[2] v. Löher, pp. 106–300; Sugenheim, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, i. 81–82.

[3] v. Löher, p. 51; Strunck, iii. 658. 'Nothing shows more positively the ardent depth of their faith, the iron, unbreakable strength of their

Bishop put an end to public exercise of Protestant worship.[1]

As in Lower so also in Upper Germany, the Catholic restoration movement went on gaining strength, especially in the prince-bishopric of Würzburg under Bishop Julius Echter of Mespelbrunn. A pupil of the German College, this prelate acquired from friend and foe alike the title of one of 'the most powerful champions of the papacy.' The Jesuits, who had already gained a firm footing in the bishopric before his accession, became, as Julius testified later on, 'with all thankfulness,' his 'most successful and indefatigable helpers in the work of reformation in the diocese.' But in the old Orders also the enthusiastic Bishop found true-hearted co-operators in his difficult work: as, for instance, among the Minorites, Martin Digasser, well known by his sermons and his writings on asceticism, who became later on court preacher to the Archduke Matthias.[2]

Bishop Julius's first step in 1582 was to found anew the University of Würzburg, and to attach to it three colleges as 'nursery schools for future priests and missionaries;' he next announced his 'firm and unmovable resolution' to act in accordance with his episcopal office, and the reform rights bestowed on him by the Religious Peace, and to forbid any and every

will, than that they did not even for a moment despair of being able to bring even these burghers to inward conviction. Every hour, by day and by night, and decade after decade, they gave to their vocation every breath both of their spiritual and physical strength in joyous sacrifice.' 'Restless, tireless were they in their search and chase after souls who might be brought back to the Catholic Church, or at any rate to better moral lives' (v. Löher, pp. 297, 299).

[1] See Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 707–708.

[2] See K. Eubel, *Geschichte der oberdeutschen Minoriten* (Würzburg, 1886), p. 124.

further exercise of the Protestant faith within his bishopric. 'The noble Order of Knights of the Franconian Land' sent in a petition to the Bishop on the festival of St. Peter's Chair, 1582, demanding, among other things, the total abolition of the ecclesiastical councillors and of the Jesuits, the grant of a chapel at Würzburg to the Lutheran preachers, and permission of marriage to the country clergy.[1] But Julius was immovable. In these as in other matters he went forward with reckless energy. Within a few years more than a hundred Lutheran preachers were obliged to leave the country, and for the subjects also there was no alternative but either to abide by the Catholic faith, or else within a stated time to migrate elsewhere.[2] 'This is indeed a very rigorous measure,' the Pastor Weinhold at Aschaffenburg allowed; 'nobody ought to be coerced in religion, but our bishop is following the example of the Protestant rulers. For let anyone who is disposed to cast special blame on this Prince consider how the Protestant princes and towns have treated the Catholics. Furthermore, as we can see with our eyes in the Empire, wherever the Protestants under

[1] Ehmel, *Handschriften*, i. 368. For the refounding of the Würzburg University by the Prince-Bishop Julius, and its internal conditions at the time of this bishop, see Wegele, *Geschichte der Universität Würzburg* (Würzburg, 1882), i. 128 ff., 215 ff.; ii. 127 ff.; see also Braun, *Heranbildung des Klerus*, p. 171 ff.

[2] Buchinger, p. 169 ff.; Ritter, *Deutsche Gesch.* i. 626 ff. The reckless energy which Julius everywhere displayed involved him in numberless contests which are described in an interesting manner, though with great partiality, by Kadner in 'Zur Characteristik des Fürstbischofs Julius,' in Kolde's *Beiträgen zur bayer. Kirchengesch.* (Erlangen, 1899), v. 271 ff. But Kadner himself, in spite of his aversion to Julius, is obliged to confess that 'What he was, he was out and out; what he wanted he carried through obdurately. Thus Julius was able to break down the strongest resistance of his own chapter, and here he was frequently in the right, for he had the wider outlook.'

Catholic rulers are allowed free exercise of their religion, they are not satisfied with this much, but very soon begin to want to get the whole management in their own hands, and to prescribe to the rulers what they ought to do; they will not even allow them to have Catholic officials and councillors of their own choosing; they suppress the Catholics, and they allow—nay, even command—that from the pulpit the Catholics be inveighed against, vilified and cursed as idolaters and man-worshippers. Is there anyone brazen-faced enough to deny that this is true? Name, if you can, any country, any town, where this is not the practice? But no respectable Catholic authorities can possibly tolerate such preachers. When, however, the preachers are abolished, the people will be obliged to acknowledge the pastor who is appointed by the Bishop as the rightful shepherd; they will be obliged to let their children be baptised by him, and receive instruction from him, and take part in the Church services, just as the subjects of Protestant territories are obliged to submit to their rulers, and indeed under pain of heavy punishment.'[1] The Jesuit Georg Scherer defended the Bishop's measures in 1588 on the same grounds. He said, 'The Estates and princes of the Holy Roman Empire, who are adherents of the Augsburg Confession, understand, maintain, and carry out the terms of the Religious Peace in such a manner that in their territories their confession alone holds good, and must be put into practice, and if one or more of their subjects do not approve of the Lutheran tenets, but openly practise the old Catholic religion, celebrate Masses, and preach Catholic doctrine, they are

[1] In the dedication to the pamphlet *Kurzfassliche Erklerung katholischer Lehren und Ceremonien*, &c. (1587), Bl. 2.

not allowed to continue this course, but are obliged to leave the country with their wives and children. And why may not the Catholic princes and Estates of the Empire avail themselves in their territories of these same liberties and rights conferred by the Religious Peace? why may they not in like manner tolerate none but their Catholic religion and rites, and drive out of their way all the Lutheran preachers with all the subjects who cling to them, and will not give up their doctrines and observances? For what is lawful for the Protestants cannot be unlawful for the Catholics.' Did the Protestant preachers, asked Scherer, allow freedom of religion to the Catholics of the bishopric? It had not yet been forgotten 'with what severity the preachers had treated the Catholics in the bishopric of Würzburg, in all the places where they had intruded themselves, and where, without any legal appointment, they had taken possession of all the pastoral offices and privileges, in order that they might compel the inhabitants to abjure their ancient traditional religion. For if God had, for instance, given anyone a little child, the preachers refused to baptise it until the parents had renounced their Catholic faith and become Lutheran. If anyone died in any house, they would not remove the corpse until those of the household had foresworn the Catholic faith and Church.' This was certainly not what they now claimed for themselves, viz. that each one should be left free to believe as he liked. 'Can it be said that the consciences of the Catholics under your rule are entitled to no more liberty than such a one?' If the preachers had the management of affairs in their own hands, freedom of Catholic worship would mean nothing more or less than 'Eat bird, or else die.'

Even in the towns and boroughs of Catholic princes 'no one was allowed to be admitted into citizenship who had been observed to follow the faith and religion of his territorial prince; and those who were already burghers and Catholics were oppressed, plagued, and tormented to such an extent that any fate seemed better to them than to dwell under such devouring wolves.' Besides all this, the Protestants were always at war with each other. It was a wonder to hear and to behold 'how they persecuted each other, deposed, outbid, expelled each other, how they drove each other with wives and children into misery, how the Flacians and the Substantialists, who set up as the kernel of Lutheranism, grumbled and complained in the loudest manner about the Ubiquists and the Accidentalists.' 'What numbers of pious Christian believers,' says Cyriacus Spangenberg in a letter to the people of Würzburg and district, 'have only lately been driven into poverty and exile by the Accidentalists!' [1]

Bishop Julius, accompanied by a few Jesuits, personally conducted a visitation of all the churches in the diocese. 'Out of pure and ardent devotion and episcopal zeal, he goes round in his own person,' so it was proudly said, 'risks his body and life, visits his sheep, ordains, consoles, instructs, admonishes.' In many places he administered the Holy Communion in one day, with his own hands, to 200, 400, or 500 persons.[2] 'Considering the position and habits of most of the bishops of that time,' as Cardinal Otto Truchsess has painted them,[3] such pastoral solicitude was regarded

[1] Scherer, *Verantwortung*, &c., in the Munich edition of his works, i. 381, 420.

[2] Scherer, *Verantwortung, loc. cit.*

[3] See above, p. 299.

as something quite extraordinary, and reflecting Protestants 'could not deny that, however hardly the Bishop of Würzburg oppressed his evangelical subjects, it was nevertheless highly praiseworthy that he should go to work in his own person with such devotion and enthusiasm for his faith, and should undergo for it such immense toil and trouble; it was not very often that distinguished prelates and princely lords behaved like this in the midst of their pomp and splendour.'[1] People were so little used to 'such zeal and activity' among the bishops that it was considered, for instance, worth while to record, 'as an example of admirable zeal for Christians in time to come,' that Archbishop Daniel Brendel of Mayence had once personally confirmed over 150 children and adults, and had administered the Holy Eucharist to an even larger number of persons. 'Zeal such as this,' it was thought, could only be due to the influence of the Jesuits, and the Archbishop himself, in proof of his gratitude to the latter, had presented them with 20,000 gold florins for the building of colleges.[2]

Among the Jesuits who worked under the auspices of the Bishop of Würzburg, Gerhard Weller stood out prominently. He went about on foot, without any baggage, preaching and catechising from place to place, and caring nothing that he was ridiculed in comedies, and that it was said of him that he was not a man, but an evil spirit with a cloven foot.[3]

In the years 1585 and 1586 over 60,000 Protestants

[1] Quoted in the *Kurzfasslichen Erklerung*, see above, p. 363, note 1, Bl. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] E. Sang, *Triumphus Franconiae* (Wirceburgi, 1618), in Gropp, *Coll. script. Wirceb.* i. 641; cf. Buchinger, p. 171.

were brought back to the Catholic Church: at the end of five years there were very few people left in the whole bishopric who professed any other faith.[1] The preacher Utzinger, from Smalkald, who in two pamphlets full of virulent abuse of the papacy and the Catholic princes, had clamoured for the removal of Bishop Julius, was inconsolable at the fact that his co-religionists let themselves be so easily turned away from the 'Evangel' when they had nothing worse to fear than migration. 'It is truly astonishing,' he writes, 'that there should be such terrible and reckless apostasy as so many Christians are nowadays guilty of in Franconia for such slight persecution. What makes their conduct particularly blamable and disgraceful is that they have acted in this way without being driven to any extremity of danger; they have apostatised wantonly, with scarcely any pressure or coercion. For what has been done to them to drive them to this course? Nothing more than notice given them to remove elsewhere.'[2] In some places, however, the number of those who remained steadfast in their faith was by no means small. Nearly 80 Protestant burghers migrated from Münnerstadt,[3] and about 70 from Carlstadt.[4] At Münnerstadt a Catholic gymnasium was erected later on by the Bishop.[5]

Julius was an especially zealous promoter of popular education, and founder of popular schools, but he was none the less eager also for the urgently needed reform

[1] Sacchinus, *Hist. Soc. Jesu*, pars 5, lib. 5, no. 114; cf. Huber, *Der Jesuiterorden*, pp. 133–134.

[2] Scherer, *Verantwortung*, i. 382 ff. We shall have more to say about Utzinger later on.

[3] Buchinger, p. 177; Reiniger, *Münnerstadt und seine nächste Umgebung* (Würzburg, 1852), p. 187. Father Weller enjoined attendance at church on Sundays in this place, under penalty of a fine of five thalers.

[4] Heppe, *Restauration*, p. 169. [5] Buchinger, pp. 164–166.

of the clergy. The latter, so the Bishop lamented, 'by the profligacy of their lives, which gave rise to universal scandal, and by their gross neglect of their ministerial functions and duties, had manifestly been the largest contributors to the spread of heresy in the bishopric.' Full and careful attention was now to be directed to the worthy celebration of divine service; the old Catholic rites, processions, and pilgrimages were restored everywhere; the old convents were again occupied and new ones erected; numbers of new parishes were instituted, and no less than 300 churches built or restored.[1] One who could speak as an eye-witness, the Belgian Daniel Eremita, could not sufficiently praise the pastoral solicitude of Bishop Julius.[2]

Julius displayed true fatherly affection towards the poor and the sick. 'It was through compassionate love,' he said once to Doctor Ludwig van Gennep, 'that Christianity conquered the world, and it is first and foremost by love that we in our cold-hearted self-seeking times must strive to kindle anew in the minds of the people ardour for our holy faith.'[3] 'I do not remember ever having read,' he said in the introduction to a set of hospital regulations, 'that those who gladly performed works of Christian love ever had unhappy deaths; for such men and women have many advocates with God, and it is impossible that the prayers of such numbers should remain unanswered.'[4] The Bishop inspected and investigated all institutions for the sick and the poor, hospitals, and endowed establishments, gave them fresh rules and regulations, endeavoured as far as possible to recover the property stolen from them, or

[1] Buchinger, pp. 181–207. [2] Eremita, pp. 350–351, in the year 1609.
[3] See above, p. 340, note 3. [4] Buchinger, p. 246.

to procure compensation for it, established new endowments, supported and promoted the erection of new buildings 'for suffering humanity, for the needy and the infirm, our brothers in Christ.' We have monuments of this munificent love in the hospitals of Arnstein, Carlstadt, Dettelbach, Ebern, Gerolzhofen, Hassfurt, Heidingsfeld, Iphofen, Königshofen, Mellrichstadt, Münnerstadt, Neustadt, Röttingen, and Volkach.[1] 'Bishop Julius,' wrote Doctor van Gennep in 1595, after his return from a journey in Franconia, 'is called all over his land the father of the poor and the sick, on account of his active and practical kindness to all institutions established with a view to lessening human misery. He visits them all frequently in person, speaking words of comfort and cheer, now here, now there; many indeed of their inmates have been nursed and tended with his own hands, and have thus been won over to the Catholic faith. His noblest and greatest creation is the splendid hospital in his capital of Würzburg, with which few others in Germany can be compared.'[2] This 'Universal Hospital of the Diocese' was established for the benefit of 'the poor and sick of all sorts, and for other necessitous and disabled persons who required good nursing and doctoring; likewise for deserted orphans, itinerant pilgrims, and other persons in want, to whom suitable hospitality and assistance were to be given.' All services were gratuitous; people of means were not to be allowed to make payments, for otherwise the care of the poor would come to be neglected.[3]

[1] Buchinger, pp. 243–247; cf. p. 263. [2] See above, p. 340, note 3.

[3] Buchinger, pp. 247–256. The Julius Hospital is still to-day 'one of the largest beneficent institutions in Germany, and during its three

In the bishopric of Fulda, also, Catholicism had made important progress, thanks to the indefatigable labours of the Jesuits.

When the Abbot Balthasar von Dernbach, after six and twenty years of exile, was restored in 1602 to rightful possession of the abbacy by the decision of the Imperial Tribunal, he made all haste to push on the work of Catholic restoration.[1] He ordered a general visitation of his diocese, organised people's missions, caused all the preachers to be removed, and expatriated any of his subjects who refused to return to the Catholic faith. At Hammelburg only did he meet with any obstacles at the outset; but here too he soon carried his way; the larger portion of the inhabitants abjured their Protestant belief, and only some hundred of them migrated from the district.[2] With a view to the lessening of physical suffering, the abbot built a hospital for poor women, while he gave munificent donations in support of one for men that already existed. His

centuries of existence it has conferred endless blessings on the town and on the bishopric.' The magnitude of the services rendered by its founder during his rule of forty-four years is now generally recognised. Representatives of quite other opinions admire in the Prince-Bishop Julius, 'his courage, his undauntable persistence, and his fiery zeal,' as well as 'his enviable administrative power, his magnanimity, and his universal culture; qualities, all these, which raised him to the rank of the greatest prince in the duchy of Franconia. His devotion to the Catholic Church, his zeal in combating the Reformation, and his oft-declared determination to do all he could to remedy the acknowledged abuses in the Catholic Church—lay and clerical alike—entitle him also to be regarded as the greatest bishop who ever occupied the chair of St. Burchard' (W. Burkhard, in the *Allgem. Zeitung* (1882), Beil. No. 628).

[1] See Komp, *Fürstabt Balthasar*, pp. 106–133; Egloffstein, *Balthasar von Dernbach*, p. 38 ff.

[2] Heppe, *Entstehung, Kämpfe und Untergang evangelischer Gemeinden in Deutschland, urkundl. dargestellt.* Heft I. Hammelburg und Fulda (Wiesbaden, 1862), p. 177 ff.; Komp, *Fürstabt Balthasar*, p. 293 ff.; Egloffstein, *Balthasar von Dernbach*, p. 77 ff.

especial hobby was to provide educational institutes for the country. During the years of his banishment he had bestowed the utmost care and attention on the papal seminary founded at Fulda by Gregory XIII. for the benefit of 40 pupils of noble birth; under Sixtus V. he succeeded in bringing about the addition to this institution of 60 free places for needy students of the burgher class. A new building erected under his auspices provided accommodation for 130 pupils.[1] The Jesuit school connected with the seminary counted yearly, since 1601, more than 500 pupils.[2]

In the bishopric of Augsburg, since the year 1559, the varied industry of Canisius had been especially fruitful and efficacious, as well in the cathedral pulpit of Augsburg as in missionary activity and catechetical instruction in town and district.[3] A few other Jesuits also 'had come forward in a manly and praiseworthy manner as helpers of the poor and sick in the bishopric.' In the year 1582, through the generosity of the Fuggers, the Fathers were provided with a large college in Augsburg and a richly furnished gymnasium: the founders spent no less than 96,000 florins on the erection and extension of the institutions.[4] 'The disorderly canons and the profligate priests,' who dreaded stern moral disciplinarians, had set themselves violently against 'the settling in of the Jesuits,' and had circulated

[1] Komp, *Fürstabt Balthasar*, pp. 288–299; Komp, *Zweite Schule*, p. 28. See the article entitled 'Zur Gesch. der Jesuitenschulen' in the *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 71 (1878), 235 ff.

[2] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1601*, p. 597.

[3] See our remarks, vol. viii. p. 244 ff.

[4] Fuller details in Braun, *Gesch. des Kollegiums der Jesuiten in Augsburg*, pp. 4–36; *Schreiben der Fugger an Gregor XIII. vom 3 Jan. 1583*, in Theiner, *Annales*, iii. 414.

every imaginable slander and calumny against the Society of Jesus. 'We can emphatically assert and affirm'—so the Fuggers had already written ten years before, to Gregory XIII.—'that, with the exception of one or two good-for-nothing fellows, there is not a single Catholic layman in the whole town who does not venerate the Jesuits as models of virtue and of genuine piety, and who does not think himself fortunate in enjoying intercourse with them, and gaining their good-will.' The attitude of the clergy to the Jesuits was certainly very different, but that was easily explained: there were in Germany numbers of canons and priests who in profligacy, extravagance in dress, and blasphemy, surpassed even the Lanzknechts.[1] And this was the very reason why the Fuggers—and also the Dukes Albert V. and William V. of Bavaria—had thought it imperatively necessary to erect a Jesuit college in Augsburg; such an institution, they believed, would combat erroneous doctrine, and train up a body of men, firm in character and genuinely religious, and would be of the highest benefit, not only for the diocese of Augsburg, but for the whole Empire, because the town of Augsburg was looked up to so universally.[2] With the acquiescence of the General of the Order the Jesuits had pledged themselves to the magistrates that neither they nor their pupils would act in opposition to the Religious Peace;[3] the magistrates, on their part, showed them all possible good-will; Bishop Henry of Knöringen, in his reports to Rome, repeatedly spoke of the fair and considerate manner in which—without prejudice to the rights of the Protestants—the municipal

[1] May 30, 1573, in Theiner, *Annales*, i. 89.
[2] See the Letters in Theiner, i. 31–32, 84 ff.
[3] Braun, pp. 26–27.

authorities treated the Catholics.[1] James Spanmiller, known as Pontanus, one of the most notable Schoolmen of the century, managed the whole Catholic gymnasium in the capacity of prefect of studies; by 1605 the number of pupils had risen to 380, and in the following year it increased to 400.[2]

After 1589 the Jesuits established four Congregations of students and burghers in Augsburg,[3] and they also organised frequent missions to the people in the neighbourhood.[4] In 1601 twenty-one villages between Augsburg and Oberndorf, which had grown demoralised through want of pastors, were brought back to the practice of the Catholic religion by the influence of six Fathers: most of the people made confession of the sins of their whole past lives.[5] In Augsburg, where at first Canisius had had barely 50 listeners, and where scarcely 800 persons received Easter Communion, the number of Easter communicants had risen by the year 1595 to nearly 2,500,[6] by the year 1600 to 4,000, and ten years later to 6,700.[7]

'The Catholic Pearl' of the bishopric was the Students' Institute at Dillingen erected by the Cardinal Bishop Otto von Truchsess, and afterwards expanded into a university, where the Jesuits had started their educational work in 1564. In 1585 Gregory XIII. founded a papal seminary by means of a yearly subsidy of 3,000 scudi.[8] In 1600 the boarding-school comprised 230 pupils; at the University the number of students

[1] Steichele, *Beiträge*, i. 50, 53.
[2] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1605*, p. 629; *ad a. 1606*, p. 385.
[3] Braun, p. 127 ff. [4] Braun, p. 138 ff.
[5] Flotto, p. 34 ff.; cf. Steichele, *Beiträge*, i. 49–50.
[6] Statement by Gennep in the letter quoted before.
[7] Steichele, *Beiträge*, i. 63.
[8] Hausmann, *Gesch. des ehemaligen päpstlichen Alumnates in Dillingen* (Dillingen, 1883), and Duhr in the *Hist. Jahrb.* 7 (1886), 369 ff.

was frequently 650, among them a large proportion of men of noble birth from different countries; six years later the number of students was reckoned at 730.[1] 'The Jesuits of Dillingen,' said a Protestant polemical writer, 'are among the most dangerous members of the Order, for they are learned beyond measure, and indefatigable in teaching and preaching; and they are more than any others instigated by the devil to foist the idolatrous papacy on old and young, by all manner of means and arts; they entice countless souls away from the evangel, and they and all their distinguished followers are villains of so desperate a nature that it is not easy to get the better of them.'[2]

By the instructions and the writings of the Jesuits many conversions were made in the ranks of the high nobility. Count Ulrich von Helfenstein zu Wiesensteig, for instance, who had become a Protestant through the influence of the Tübingen provost James Andrea, and who had laid hands on the collegiate abbey of Wiesensteig, was led back to the old faith by Father James Rabenstein from Dillingen.[3] Of the Alsatian branch of this family, Count Schweikart of Helfenstein and his wife Maria, Countess of Hohenzollern, were won over to the Church. The Count erected a college at Landsberg in which, in 1601, 43 Jesuits were at work.[4] The entire county and the lordship of Bissingen now belonged again to the Catholic faith.[5]

[1] Steichele, *Beiträge*, i. 14–15, 55, 63; *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1606*, p. 380. See also the *Urtheil der Zimmerischen Chronik*, ii. 332.

[2] *Wölfe im Schafspeltz*, Bl. 15, 17.

[3] April 24, 1567. Sacchinus, *Vita Canisii*, pp. 237–239; Riess, pp. 359–360. The official announcement of the Count's conversion, contributed by Baumann to the Freiburg diocesan Archives, x. 115–119.

[4] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1601*, p. 501.

[5] For the 'counter-reformation' in Schwäbisch-Gmünd, where council

In the bishopric of Bamberg at the beginning of the seventeenth century the condition of the Church was lamentable. Bishop Neidhard of Thüngen (1591–1598), under the influence of Duke William V. of Bavaria and Bishop Julius of Würzburg, had exerted himself most strenuously in the cause of Catholic restoration, and had busied himself with plans for the erection of a Jesuit College.[1] After his death, however, the chapter, which was chiefly Protestant, elected (1599) the cathedral dean, John Philip of Gebsattel, to the bishopric. In order to obtain papal confirmation, Gebsattel pledged himself by oath to the Tridentine profession of faith, simulated ardent zeal for the Catholic cause, and unreserved submission to the Apostolic See. But no sooner had he obtained confirmation than he threw off the mask, refused to be ordained priest and bishop, granted the clergy permission to marry, and surrounded himself with disreputable women. 'To speak confidentially,' wrote Bishop Julius to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria on May 28, 1604, 'things' are in a very bad way at Bamberg, for the Bishop, as well as several other ecclesiastics, is greatly addicted to the vice of unchastity. Among the clergy there is no discipline whatever. The dean of the cathedral, on whom great hopes were fixed, has also saddled himself with a concubine, and a little while ago he had an infant publicly baptised,

and town pastor found support in the Bishop of Augsburg and the Jesuits of the district, see Wagner in the *Württemb. Vierteljahrsschrift für Landesgesch.* N. F. 10 (1901); cf. *Hist. Zeitschr.* pp. 87, 361.

[1] Fuller details in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 387–394, and in Zagel's article (based on extensive study of archives) 'Die Gegenreformation im Bistum Bamberg unter Fürstbischof Neidhard von Thüngen, 1591–1598,' in the *Archiv für Gesch. und Alterskunde von Oberfranken*, 21 (Bayreuth, 1899), 19 ff. Zobel's treatise, *Die Gegenreformation in Bamberg*, 1591–1598, Erlangen (Dissertation), 1900, was not accessible to me.

and invited the Bishop's brother to stand godfather; the Bishop also sent his councillors and the gentlemen of his house to the christening. The day was spent in sensuous pleasures and immoderate eating and drinking. The general tone and character of the place is worldly and material, and there is scarcely any spiritual life anywhere in it; this causes great scandal among the lower classes, and it is a common saying with them that they doubt if there is one godly person among the lot.' The Bishop's court is on a scale 'of the greatest magnificence; the offices are all filled with avowed Lutherans.' The Bishop had two Calvinistic nobles for his confidential advisers. He himself was a decided antagonist of the Jesuits, and he talked contemptuously of the Pope; Catholic devotional exercises, daily Masses, fasting, and pilgrimages, and the doctrines of purgatory and of the saints were repugnant to him.[1]

It was not till after the death of Gebsattel in 1609, when Johann Gottfried of Aschhausen, a man of blameless conduct and of great erudition, was appointed Bishop, that a happy turn of things came about. The new Bishop made over the cathedral pulpit and the management of the seminary for priests to the Jesuits, and built them a gymnasium (school). To the Fathers also was committed the direction of the thirteen town schools, the five foundation schools, and the two leper houses.[2] The most active agent in the suppression of Protestantism was the Vicar-General and Bishop

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 396–403, and ii. 929; S. A. Stumpf in the *Zeitschr. für Bayern und die angrenzenden Länder*, i. (Munich, 1816), 16–35; cf. Mayr-Deisinger, *Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau*, p. 183, note 128.

[2] Weber, *Gesch. der gelehrten Schulen in Bamberg*, p. 94. Cf. Weber's monograph, *Joh. Gottfr. von Aschausen, Fürstbischof von Bamberg und Herzog zu Franken* (Würzburg, 1889).

Auxiliary, Friedrich Forner, who had suffered heavy persecution for his ecclesiastical zeal during the administration of Gebsattel.[1]

In the archbishopric of Salzburg circumstances corresponded to those of the bishopric of Bamberg. George von Khuenberg had then been succeeded by Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau (1587–1612). George, as coadjutor and Archbishop, had laboured zealously since 1580 for the restoration of the Catholic faith, and by his edifying conduct, his care for the poor and the orphans, and his promotion of scientific studies, he had acquired an excellent renown.[2] Wolf Dietrich, on the other hand, was only 'a sham zealot.' It is true that not long after his accession in the year 1588, he had issued the command that 'all persons in Salzburg who would not become Catholics must leave the land within fourteen days, or, at the outside, four weeks.' But 'those who knew him knew well that this was only done for show.' Concerning Church laws he troubled himself no whit; he lived in open concubinage with the daughter of a burgher of Salzburg, and consumed large sums of money on her and her children, three sons and seven daughters. Life at the episcopal court became so excessively scandalous that 'verily it filled many souls with horror.' Of the Jesuits 'who once remonstrated seriously with him' Wolf Dietrich said 'they were the devil's house villains;' he would 'keep them far away from his bishopric and never admit them into it.'[3] He said once to a delegate of the Calvinistic

[1] See for Forner the article in the *Hist.-pol. Bl.* 86, 565–582, 656–672.

[2] Wolf. *Geschichtliche Bilder*, p. 180.

[3] Quoted from an unknown ecclesiastical councillor of Salzburg, October 3, 1606, in the *Theologische Miscellen*, Heft 1 (all published), pp. 27–28. Cf. Mayr-Deisinger, *Wolf Dietrich von Raittenau*, p. 48 ff., 64, 91, 93, 96 ff.

Prince Christian of Anhalt, that he was ready, at the request of his subjects, to grant them freedom of religion, 'and that he and others had only to do with this world, and had no authority to prescribe law and order concerning things of heaven; we had all of us, however, one God and one selfsame Christ, on whose foundation we all built; among the Jews there had been Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and other sects besides, but they had held together without quarrelling in one synagogue, one temple, and one people of God.'[1]

Protestantism was able to hold its own and to spread undisturbed in the archbishopric of Salzburg during the administration of Wolf Dietrich, and it was not till the advent of his successor, Marx Sittich, Count of Hohenembs (1612–1617), that stern measures were passed for restoring unity of faith in the diocese. In the first two years of Archbishop Sittich's rule nearly 600 Protestants migrated from Gastein.[2]

The author shows that Wolf Dietrich in his 'counter-reform' efforts was not impelled by ecclesiastical aims, but solely by the selfish personal desire to get votes at Rome for his nomination to a cardinalate. After the defeat of this hope Wolf Dietrich never gave another thought to opposing the spread of Lutheranism in his territory.

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 203, 205.

[2] In the years 1613 and 1614. Fuller details in the reports of the episcopal secretary, Johann Stainhauser, in Wolf, *Geschichtl. Bilder*, pp. 187–227. Cf. Loserth, 'Die Gegenreformation in Salzburg unter dem Erzbischof Marx Sittich, Count of Hohenembs (1612–1619),' *Mittheilungen des Instit. für österreich. Geschichtsforschung*, 19 (1898), 676–696. The Archbishop at once took in hand the improvement of Church discipline among the Catholic clergy (p. 677 ff.). In 1613 began the enforcement of more rigid measures against the Protestants. Protestant subjects (in some places there were Flacians and Anabaptists side by side with the Lutherans) were given the alternative of returning to the Catholic religion or of leaving the country; the greater number chose the first of these courses. Many also of those who had migrated returned home after a short time, and pronounced themselves willing to become Catholics (p. 690). With many of them, indeed, this return to the faith was only

The Archbishop was thought even by the Catholics to have been injudiciously severe: 'as the new doctrines,' they said, 'had so long been rooted among the people of Salzburg, it would have been better to use more patience and consideration.' The measures enacted made all the worse impression in the Empire, because Marx Sittich was by no means distinguished, like a Julius von Mespelbrunn or a Balthasar von Dernbach, by a 'thoroughly consistent spiritual life,' by active apostolic zeal, or by personal devotion to the poor and the sick; but, on the contrary, he lived like a secular prince surrounded with splendour and luxury, and a brilliant court state; he indulged freely in feasting and gambling, had 'pastorals and operas' performed for his entertainment, and, to quote the words of one who was eulogising him, 'he was a lover of shows and mummeries by which he thought to honour religion.'[1]

Matters were quite different in this respect with Bishop Urban of Passau. The Jesuit George Scherer extolled him in 1585 for having 'issued the salutary decree that no more sectarian citizens were to be received into his towns and hamlets; that the corrupt and heretical schools of the Protestants were to be abolished and replaced by Catholic schools; that no prohibited books were to be read, and no heretical tracts introduced into the country;' it was also earnestly enjoined by the Bishop that 'the fanatical preachers who infested so

outward pretence (p. 691), while at heart they still adhered to Protestantism (p. 695): 'Marx Sittich, meanwhile, not only displayed unwearied zeal in exterminating Protestant doctrine in his territory, but also made a strong stand against the immorality of the clergy, and herein he was enthusiastically supported by the bishops of Central Austria.'

[1] Wolf, *Geschichtl. Bilder*, pp. 227-234.

many parishes were to be driven out like devouring wolves,' and Catholic priests and pastors appointed in their stead. Scherer at the same time praised Urban's 'assiduity in the worship of God, and in the works of benevolence which he performed daily for the poor and needy, especially for poor orphans and young girls; to the latter he gave yearly incomes to enable them to keep up their respectability and to get married in a Christian manner.' This Bishop was no less noted for 'moderation in eating and drinking, and for good domestic management free from all extravagant and unnecessary expenditure; and above all for great humility and lovingkindness.' The last 'two rare and precious jewels,' says Scherer, 'seem to me the most remarkable in persons of such high position.' [1]

[1] Scherer's Works, Brucker edition, Bl. 192–193. For the 'counter-reformation' in the archduchy of Austria and in the Tyrol, see Huber, iv. 283 ff., 310 ff., and Hirn, i. 161 ff. See also the eighth vol. of this work, Book 3, chap. 9. See further Bibl, *Die Einführung der Kathol. Gegenreformation in Niederösterreich durch Kaiser Rudolf II.* 1576–1580 (Innsbruck, 1900); Bibl, *Klesls Briefe an Rudolfs II. Oberstlhofmeister Adam Freih. v. Dietrichstein*, 1583–1589. A contribution to the 'Gesch. Klesls und der Gegenreformation in Niederösterreich' in the *Archiv für österr. Gesch.* 88 (1900), 475 ff. 'Bibl. Klesls Briefe an Herzog Wilhelm V. von Bayern 1580–1582. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Gegenreformation in Niederösterreich unter Kaiser Rudolf II.' in the *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* 21 (1900), p. 640 ff. Bibl, 'Erzherzog Ernst und die Gegenreformation in Niederösterreich,' *ibid.*, Ergänzungsband, vi. 575 ff. (Innsbruck, 1901). For Bohemia see *Hist. Zeitschr.* pp. 87, 377 ff. The Catholic restoration in Silesia was conducted by Bishop Martin von Gerstmann (1574–1585). By a thorough-going visitation of the diocese, by the introduction of Jesuits, and by the constitutions of the diocesan synods and a judicious institution of the clerical seminary, Gerstmann paved the way for the later reaction in favour of the Catholic religion. See the admirable monograph of Dr. J. Jungnitz, *Martin von Gerstmann, Bischof von Breslau* (Breslau, 1898). In the same year in which Gerstmann died, the episcopal chair of Seckau was filled by a man whose penetrating activity was a more than ordinary incentive to the descriptive pen of a history-writer. This man was Martin Brenner, who on account of the ardour of his faith received the name of 'Apostle of Styria,' and

The Protestants were thrown into the utmost state

for the crushing force of his oratory and the irresistible influence of his apostolic teaching was called, as St. Jerome had been before him, *malleus haereticorum* (the hammer of the heretics). Whereas this highly significant personality had never yet been dealt with in a monograph, the former professor of Graz, Leopold Schuster, known to fame through his valuable work on Johann Keppler, undertook the delightful task. Although Professor Schuster was called to the episcopal chair of Seckau in 1896, he still found time to complete the biographical work he had begun, and moreover just in time for publication at the tercentenary jubilee in honour of the principal monument of Brenner's activity, the restoration of the Catholic religion in Styria. The monograph was entitled *Fürstbischof Martin Brenner* (Graz, 1898). The exhaustive study of archives on which his work is based gives the book a permanent value. The chief sources of information were naturally supplied by the Seckau 'Episcopal Archives' at Graz, namely, Martin's visitation reports and a Latin work, *Vita Martini episcopi Seccov.* Other acts and documents were taken from the papal secret archives, from the Viennese House, Court, and State archives, from the Salzburg consistorial archives, from the monasteries of Vorau, Reun, Admont, and St. Lambach, and finally from the government archives at Graz, Salzburg, and Innsbruck. It is on the groundwork of this wealth of original documents that Schuster has built up his exhaustive narrative. The introductory pages deal with Martin's youth and student years, and his work in Salzburg, and then follows a description of his labours as Bishop of Seckau from 1585–1615, in which he stands out in the light of a veritable reformer. The melancholy and difficult conditions with which he had to contend are depicted in a special chapter on the political, social, and religious condition of Styria at that period, and following on this are chapters: I. On Martin's episcopal labours up to the re-Catholisation of Styria under Ferdinand II.; II. Bishop Martin and the re-Catholisation of Central Austria under Ferdinand II.; III. Prince-Bishop Martin and the consolidation of the restored religion. Dr. C. Holl has dealt briefly with the Prince-Bishop James Fugger of Constance, and the Catholic reform of the diocese in the first quarter of the seventeenth century (Freiburg, 1898). James Fugger had the management of the widely-extending diocese of Constance from 1604 to 1626. Its condition was in many respects deplorable: the episcopal jurisdiction had been immensely curtailed in its scope by new religionists—and possibly even more by loyal Catholic landowners and patrons; the Church possessions had been withdrawn from almost all clerical influence; the moral character of the clergy was not blameless. Prince-Bishop James made use of the Jesuits and the Capuchins to prepare the way for the internal reform of his diocesans, held a synod in 1609, and caused the different parishes to be visited. The political and secular relations of the bishopric to Switzerland, and the town of Constance, the objectionable struggles

of agitation by the religious proceedings in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola.[1]

In the year 1572 the ruler of these lands, the Archduke Charles (youngest brother of the Emperor Maximilian II.), at a provincial diet at Bruck on the Mur, had given a verbal promise to the Protestant lords and knights of Styria—who would not otherwise have taken

with the cathedral chapter afford an insight into the difficulties attendant on good, methodical diocesan management. In his private life James was a model of a thoroughly moral and a deeply religious priest and bishop. His last resting-place is in the Capuchin Church at Constance. For the work of Bishop Christopher IV., Andreas Freih. v. Spaus, 1601–1613, of Brixen, whose activity may be called 'reformatory' in the best sense of the word, see the monograph by Dr. J. Freiseisen (Brixen, 1900).

[1] The work of the provost James Rosolenz of Mayence on the 'counter-reformation' in Styria, Carniola, and Carinthia ('*Gründlicher Gegenbericht auff den falschen Bericht unnd vermeinte Erinnerung Davidis Rungii Wittenbergischen Professors. . . .*' (Graz, 1606), is dealt with by Loserth in the *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* 21 (1900), pp. 485–517. Nearly all later works on the subject, he says, are based on Rosolenz, either directly or indirectly through Khevenhiller's *Annales Ferdinandei*; the newest literature through Hurter. The result of this, according to Loserth, is that a whole string of errors, which originate with Rosolenz, run through nearly the whole mass of literature on the subject (he makes honourable exception only with regard to the writings of Peinlich, p. 486). It must, however, be added that Loserth, while reproaching his opponents for uncritical use of the work of Rosolenz, is himself often very partial in the use of his Protestant documents (see Hirn in the *Österr. Litt.-Blatt*, 1899, No. 18, and *Zeitschr. für Kathol. Theol.* 1899, p. 704 ff.). For an estimate on the degree of objectivity to which Loserth's work (the merit and importance of which I nevertheless fully acknowledge) can lay claim, I refer the reader to Chroust's article in the *Allg. Zeitung*, 1900, Beil. No. 270 and 271. Chroust says here: 'What the author gives us in the book in question is after all only welcome contributions to the history leading up to the counter-reformation (in Central Austria). I say *contributions*, because the author himself only throws light from one side of the question—only presents the history of the struggle between the Estates and the government on account of religion. This historic presentation is moreover almost exclusively based on the documents and protocols *of one party*—that is to say, the evangelical Estates—and therefore it follows of necessity that Loserth *sees the course of the struggle through the spectacles of this party* [the italics are the reviewer's]. It was certainly far from the author's intention to become a partisan, but it happened with him as with many another truth-loving investigator; he was compelled

part in any provincial transactions—that he would not oppress them, their families, their dependents and their subjects in matters of religion, and that he would not proceed aggressively against their preachers, churches, and schools: 'he himself,' he said, 'intended to remain true to the faith of his fathers, but he would not disturb the lords and nobles in their convictions.' Then, as the Turkish danger in Central Austria continued to increase, and the Protestant section of the provincial Estates refused to give any help without religious concessions, Charles saw himself obliged, at a provincial diet at Bruck in 1578, to make still further advances to the new religionists. On February 9, in the presence of four privy councillors, he made the following verbal declaration to the Protestants: —

'Although I had fully expected that you would have been quite satisfied with my latest declaration concerning this religious article, and that you would not have felt any want of confidence in me personally, especially as I said that I could not go further save at the risk of my soul's salvation, nevertheless, since you have handed me in another written statement, I have resolved to explain my intentions once more. I do not doubt that you will have understood that all that I and my counsellors once agreed to, viz. the Religious Pacification as it was settled at Spires, I shall observe and keep with all due propriety.

'I cannot remember ever having acted, or having

against his better will to take sides with the only party with whose documents he was acquainted. The writer of history, however—especially of political history—holds against his will the office of judge, and for him too, therefore, the old saying is binding:

Eines Mannes Red', keines Mannes Red';
Du sollst die Part' verhören beed'.
(One man's word is no man's word;
Both the parties should be heard.)

issued commands in opposition to this treaty. I promise in future also to observe the terms of the said Pacification towards you all who are assembled here, and towards all persons who are adherents of the Augsburg Confession; but you on your part must behave honourably, and you must put a stop entirely to the insults and vilifications which your preachers make a practice of; I also on my part shall do my best in this direction. And as I declared before, and still do declare, that I intend to continue till death in the old and true religion in which I was born, baptised and brought up, you on your part must engage to trouble and disturb me and mine in our consciences as little as I shall trouble you.

'I reserve, however, entirely to myself, the government in my own towns and boroughs and private possessions, not, as people choose to say, because I want to eject the preachers and abolish the schools at Graz, Laibach, Klagenput, and Judenburg, but in order that I may stop your pulpit abuse and calumnies, and put an end to the jeering language by which I and my co-religionists are attacked, not only by the preachers, but also, as is well known, by people in the streets. These things must not be: on the contrary, we must speak of one another in a brotherly and Christian manner.

'Likewise, I will not tyrannise over the consciences of the burghers. Just as hitherto I have not ruffled a hair of your heads on account of your religion, so in future shall I leave you and yours undisturbed. But I tell you plainly also that I will not suffer the burghers to bring preachers at their pleasure into the towns and hamlets. The burghers, however, I will leave at

liberty in their consciences; you may rely on me in this respect.'[1]

The Protestant nobles, however, were not satisfied with these concessions; their great aim was to acquire for themselves more and more dominion in the land. The Protestant nobles, the Archduke complained to his brother Ferdinand of Tyrol, were bent on driving all Catholics out of the country; and they aimed not only at the extermination of the Catholic religion, but also at doing away with rightful obedience in things secular. They required the Archduke to dismiss the governor of his own castle at Graz, because he was an unconvertible Catholic, and to place over towns and castles such men only as they themselves should recommend. They wrested from him the citadels of Judenburg and St. Veit, 'so that in these towns,' Charles wrote, 'I must in future lodge in a hostel.' They even wanted to extort from him the right of coinage, and to have the right of free chase in his forests, stag-hunting only excepted. Cases of litigation between landed proprietors and their immediate subjects, which according to the prerogative of the Austrian House should be

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 90–91; Stobäus in Hassiz, ii. 682; cf. Huber, iv. 319 ff., and F. M. Mayer, 'Der Brucker Landtag des Jahres 1572,' in *Archiv für österr. Gesch.* 73 (1888), 467 ff. See also Loserth, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, p. 177 ff., 272; Ibid. *Die steirische Religionspacifikation*, 1572–1578, Graz, 1896 (publication of the Histor. Landeskommission für Steiermark, i.). Also by the same writer, the treatise 'Eine Fälschung des Vizekanzlers Wolfgang Schranz. Kritische Untersuchung über die Entstehung der Brucker Pacification von 1578' (*Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* 18 (1897), 341–361). In this last treatise Loserth points out that the interpretation of the Pacification of Bruck which came into vogue after the death of the Archduke Charles, and according to which the concessions obtained only benefited the provincial Estates, and not the burghers in the towns, was a falsification traceable to the Vice-Chancellor Wolfgang Schranz.

brought before the government, were now to be settled by the lords of the nobility; 'these lords also claim the privilege of not being constrained to trouble themselves about princely commands.'[1] 'Each one thinks himself entitled to do just what he wants,' wrote the Archduke in 1580, 'and to assume to himself the authority which others have from olden times possessed by indisputable title. If the lord of the manor, in accordance with his duty, tries to hinder this, they are ready at once with words of abuse, they have no scruple in calling the Sacrament of the Altar the devil incarnate, and in openly stigmatising the Pope, the Emperor, the Archduke and all his brothers and cousins as idolaters and mamelukes, as perjured, apostate Christians, and in damning them as the most wicked and dissolute men on the face of the earth.' He doubted if any other prince were exposed to the same treatment, and still more if any other would put up with it.[2]

Pope Gregory XIII. had warned the Archduke in a brief of May 7, 1578,[3] against going any further in his policy of compromise, and he had sent the nuncio Felician Ninguarda to Styria to confer with Charles concerning the precarious position into which his concessions to the Protestants had brought the Catholic Church in his dominions.[4] The nuncio represented to the Archduke the necessity for retracting these concessions; and Charles, after realising their full bearing

[1] Hurter, *Ferdinand*, i. 379–380.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 428. See the reprint of the decree of December 10, 1580, from which the passage is taken, in Loserth, *Akten*, p. 78 ff. He was obliged to submit as it were to being 'syndicised' by the Estates, 'as if he were merely a figure-head of a territorial prince,' the Archduke complained in connection with the state of things described above.

[3] Printed in the *Steiermärkische Geschichtsblätter*, i. 71–73.

[4] Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 291 ff.; *Akten*, p. xi. ff. 1 ff.

and consequences, was not disinclined to do so; but he consulted with his brother Ferdinand and his brother-in-law Duke Albert of Bavaria as to the best mode of procedure. At the conference of princes [1] held in October 1579, the principal measures for the gradual introduction of 'Catholic Restoration' in Central Austria were firmly settled. 'These principal measures form the programme which Charles II. carried out.' [2] The Archduke had already been occupied since the beginning of 1579 in concerting separate measures which should at least prevent the Protestants from overstepping the limits which, according to the confessions of Bruck, still existed, and should remind them that they were not sole lords in the land. But it was not till after 1583 that more stringent regulations were actually carried out.[3] Later on George Stobäus, Bishop of Lavant, who was an eye-witness of the proceedings, gave a more detailed account of what had passed to one of the Archduke's sons. The concessions, he wrote, which the Archduke,

[1] Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 302 ff.; *Akten*, p. 13 ff.

[2] Loserth, *Akten*, p. 13; the documents, *ibid.* pp. 31–40.

[3] For the course of the 'counter-reformation' in Styria, see Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 287 ff.; ibid. 'Akten zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich unter Erzherzog Karl II.' (1578–1590), Vienna, 1898 (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, part 2, vol. 50). By the same: 'Die Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich und der innerösterreichische Herren- und Ritterstand,' *Mitteil. des Inst. für österr. Gesch.* 4 *Erg.-Bd.* (1901), pp. 597–623, and 'Die Gegenreformation in Graz in den J. 1582–1585' (*Veröffentl. der Hist. Landeskommission*, 12), Graz, 1901. F. Ilwof, *Der Protestantismus in Steiermark, Kärnten und Krain* (Graz, 1900), p. 62 ff. In a severe criticism (*Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, 1900, No. 49, pp. 3158–3160) Loserth denies this one-sided composition any substantial scientific value; only for the period up to 1592, he says, so far as it is principally based on his own work, does it present 'a well-proportioned, just view of things.' But W. Götz, an historical writer of equally strong Protestant bias, raises the charge against Loserth's *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, that the account of the 'counter-reformation' is written from too one-sided a Protestant standpoint. See also above, p. 382, note 1.

under the pressure of the Turkish danger, made to the Protestant nobles at Bruck 'were made in the absence and even without the knowledge of the Catholic members. The Catholics were much perturbed by them, but the new religionists were jubilant. Forthwith the preachers hurried off to the four towns where free exercise of their religion had been granted them, and cried down the doctrines and laws of the Church. The name of Catholic became gradually a disgrace. The Catholics begged the Archduke to put a curb on the encroachments of the Lutherans who would not confine themselves to the four towns. But when the Archduke drew the attention of the latter to the Treaty of Bruck they answered: 'they must not rebuke anybody who wanted to come into the light of the Evangel—they must not close the way of salvation to anyone. Thereupon the Archduke (December 10, 1580) ordered the provincial Estates to dismiss the preachers at once, without delay; for whereas they would not abide by the treaty, he considered himself also absolved from it.' [1] The Estates, however, addressed themselves to the Protestant commander of

[1] The full report of the Acts of the provincial diet opened at Graz, in November 1580, is printed by Loserth side by side with the correspondence relating to these Acts, in *Akten*, p. 69 ff. In the decree of December 10, 1580, the Archduke ordains that in all his towns, boroughs, lordships, villages, hamlets, without any exception, the Catholic religion alone shall be practised. Meanwhile, the 'lords and landowners' shall be allowed to have one or two preachers for themselves in Graz, but that the said preachers shall only preach and hold their services before them and their households in the provincial assembly house, and that no one else shall be admitted during the services; also they were not to arrogate to themselves pastoral rights. In the country too they were to keep the preachers for themselves and their houses only, for their own wives, children, and servants. The Catholics were not to be subjected to any oppression from the Protestant lords 'under pretext of judicial rights,' and all that the Protestants had taken from the Catholic Church was to be restored within two months (*loc. cit.* 81 ff.).

the troops which were ready in the field against the Turks, and begged him for armed succour. He ordered a detachment of soldiers to march into the territory of Graz. In order to prevent open war, Charles (on February 3, 1581) recalled the order, which, moreover, had not once been enforced.[1] This step increased the courage of the Protestant provincial Estates. They appointed several Protestant professors to their universities at Graz, and paid them out of the government exchequer; they also erected a printing press at Graz, and deluged the land with a flood of scurrilous pamphlets. They pushed on Protestant propagandism more fiercely than before; they stormed and ransacked churches, smashed up pictures, statues, and church utensils, destroyed the books and used the church revenues either for the maintenance of the preachers or for themselves. Further, they bestowed a yearly grant from the Exchequer on individual nobles who kept preachers in their castles. Backed up by the provincial Estates, the towns went further and further in their encroachments. First of all the burghers of Rittendorf in Upper Styria expelled their lawful pastor and set up a preacher in his place.[2] The example of Oberwölz was followed by the

[1] Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 346.

[2] For the occurrences in Mitterndorf, see Loserth, *Zur Kritik des Rosolenz*, p. 496 ff. For some of these cases of forcible expulsion of Catholic priests see Loserth in the *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* 20 (1899), p. 131 ff. as opposed to L. Schuster. Loserth vindicates the proceedings of the Protestants in such cases on the ground of the preceding conduct of the clergy. So, for instance, the peasants of Oberwölz maltreated and expelled the Catholic pastor of the place (see Schuster, p. 314), because he not only used strong language about the Protestants, but also, and especially, because they looked upon him as a sorcerer who could call up storms and thus spoil their harvests. 'Nobody,' the Abbot of Admont had said, 'could persuade the people of Oberwölz that their pastor was not a sorcerer.' 'Can we wonder, after all this,' says Loserth,

people of Radkersburg, Marburg, and the inhabitants of other towns and hamlets in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola.[1] The Archduke promptly sent plenipotentiaries to all these different places to bring the people to their senses; but without any result. Here and there these ambassadors encountered great danger. The people of Graz also began to go over in shoals to the Protestant camp; the churches emptied to such an extent that the Archduke and his court retinue were at last the only ones who attended divine service. The preachers, instead of proclaiming the Word of God, spent themselves in invectives against the Catholics, and even called the Archduke himself a promoter of idolatry.[2] The effect

'if the peasants become incensed and fall foul of their shepherds?' Here then gross superstition is considered sufficient excuse for the adherents of the 'pure gospel' perpetrating deeds of violence.

[1] Loserth, *Zur Kritik des Rosolenz*, p. 504 ff. 'In a petition addressed in 1594 to the delegates of the provincial Estates by the judges, the council, and the parish of Marburg, begging for help in their church troubles, the position of ecclesiastical conditions up to and after 1584 was described. Up till nearly 1584 the petitioners said they had had a 'peace-loving' Catholic pastor, who had administered the Communion to everyone who wished it in both kinds. Then there came other turbulent pastors, blamable in life and in doctrine, who refused them this privilege; since that time the practice of running after strange preachers had gained ground, and then came the multitude of prohibitory decrees from the territorial prince respecting acts of oppression.' (The document is printed by Loserth, *Der Huldigungsstreit*, pp. 224–231.) Thus, according to Loserth, there was also justification for the Marburg Protestants who would not submit quietly when a 'peace-loving' (*i.e.* a half Protestant) 'Catholic' pastor was followed by a real Catholic.

[2] When the Protestant church and school system was organised in 1578, 'perhaps already under Chyträus,' 'it was decreed that sermons must also be preached in the abbey church (at Graz) on the days on which the Catholics celebrated the festivals of their saints, in order to warn the Protestants against the Catholic worship of idols. The preachers were thus *bound by statutory law* to inveigh against the veneration of saints, and they generally did so *very willingly, and often with fiery enthusiasm.*' 'The principal theme for venomous remarks' was afforded by the Corpus Christi festival. Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 321; *ibid.* p. 432 ff., where the

of all this was to fill the people with such bitter hatred against the Catholics, that regular risings occurred several times, and finally the populace proceeded to storm the Jesuit college, the convents, the churches, and the houses of the priests. It was only by bringing up troops that the Archduke was able to frustrate their attempts. The Bishop of Laibach, the Archduke's lieutenant-governor at the time, told me that he was scarcely ever able to go to court without being subjected to all manner of insults, and even being pelted with stones. I never at that time saw a single priest, or any man belonging to a religious order, travel abroad except in foreign garb to escape recognition. In Styria especially the situation of the Catholics was very nearly a desperate one. Meanwhile the preachers were always quarrelling with one another. The superintendent Zimmermann was accused of Calvinism by the Styrian Estates, while he on his part brought corresponding charges against his colleagues, accusing this one of Flacianism, the other of Osiandrism.[1]

author emphatically defends the Protestant pastors on the strength of this Church ordinance of theirs which obliged them from time to time to inveigh against the Catholic festivals; it was not a spirit of contention, but faithfulness to their duty, which involved the Protestant clergy in these never-ending contests. When the preachers, on these occasions, anathematised the Catholics from their pulpits for their veneration of saints, and denounced the practice as 'idolatry,' their invectives, according to Loserth, should have been regarded by the Government as 'antitheses which they were bound to utter,' and not as insults and abuse. In the *Mitteil. des Instit. für österreich. Gesch.* 20 (1899), p. 133 ff., Loserth again brings forward this opinion.

[1] Hansiz, ii. 680–687. See also Huber, iv. 326 ff., and especially the publications of Loserth, from which the following may be noticed. From the beginning of 1581 the Archduke had been proceeding against the burghers in the towns, and had forbidden them to attend the Protestant church, which was intended only for the nobles. A similar order had also been issued to the court and government officials. No special results were achieved by this means. Homberger's memorandum of

'If our spiritual pastors,' said Matthew Amman, the Protestant first secretary of the province, in May

1582 (see Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 398) shows how, in spite of all decrees put down on paper and notwithstanding their frequent complaints of oppression, the Protestants even then felt themselves lords in the land. In February 1583 the provincial secretary, Kaspar Hirsch, 'one of the leaders in the movement of the Estates,' who 'held in his hand the wires which moved first the Heidelberg and Dresden chancellery, and through it the courts of the Estates of the Augsburg Confession, 'was expelled from the country (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 417 ff. ; *Akten*, p. 399 ff.). A further step was the banishment one after another of individual preachers who had been prominent examples of pulpit abuse and invective against the Catholic faith and the institutions of the Catholic Church (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 437 ff. ; *Akten*, p. 483 ff.), the last of these being the chief pastor of Graz, Jeremiah Homberger, who was especially strong in this line, 'and who stood out prominently as one of the last pillars of the old times when the Protestants already had the power in their hands' (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 468 ff.). The decrees touching the Protestant burghers and forbidding them to attend the Protestant church of the nobles and the abbey church at Graz were also more rigidly enforced after 1583, and the penalty of banishment was inflicted on numbers of the offenders (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 431 ff. ; *Akten*, p. 477 ff.). Many, in consequence, returned to the Catholic Church. The preachers then endeavoured 'to put a check on these conversions by proclaiming the names of the apostates every Sunday before the sermon'—a proceeding which was peremptorily forbidden by the delegates of the Estates (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 472). Through the following years the Protestants continue to complain loudly that burial in Catholic churchyards is forbidden them (see Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 514 ff. ; *Akten*, pp. 608 ff., 621, 622 ff., 638 ff.). From the beginning of 1587 commissioners were sent by the territorial princes into the Protestant districts to carry through the work of re-Catholisation, and above all to turn out the preachers. In the Ennsthal their attempts ended in complete failure ; in many places the commissioners were threatened by an armed mob and compelled to withdraw. Among the nobles of this district the chief supporter of the Protestant resistance was Hans Friedrich Hoffmann (see Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 522 ff. ; *Akten*, p. 611 ff.). In other parts of Styria, the Catholic reformation 'went on slowly enough' (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 528), for the 'attempts at forcible conversion,' as Loserth calls them, were carried on with characteristic South German easy-going kindliness. Loserth cites an example from Pettau, *l.c.* p. 529. In several places the treatment was more severe, and fines, imprisonment, and finally banishment were enforced. This was also the case in Carniola (Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 530 ff.). In April 1590 there followed the decree that all persons wishing to be received as citizens in any town must take the Catholic burgher oath (Loserth,

1584, 'had sooner laid aside the egoistical, insolent, proud and unchristian zeal, which they have expended chiefly on the disturbance of the dear Christian community and which they have displayed far more than enough, God would assuredly have shown Himself gracious; but whereas they prized their accursed cupidity above all things, the punishment of the Almighty has come upon them. We have lost more adherents through the behaviour of the preachers than through the exertions of the papists.'[1] 'The preachers,' said the delegate to the provincial diet, Wilhelm von Gera, in the following year, 'will have no authority over them; it is not the papists who will destroy our Church, but the preachers themselves.'[2]

The most resolute champions of the Catholic cause were the Jesuits.[3] Their college at Graz, founded by

Reformation, p. 559 ff.). Of the Protestant acts of violence, with the exception of the above-mentioned armed resistance to the commissioners, we learn nothing from Loserth before the last rising in 1590 (p. 260, note 6).

[1] From the *Registraturbuch der Landschaftsakten* of May 5, 1584, in Peinlich, *Egkemperger Stift*, p. 53 (Amman's despatch of May 5, 1584, also in Loserth, *Akten*, p. 534 ff.); cf. Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 320 ff.: 'It cannot ever be said that the Protestants in Styria were particularly fortunate in the choice of their pastors and teachers. The latter were not seldom men of angular, stiff, and hopelessly contentious characters, who excited antagonism everywhere, and not least among their own co-religionists. Homberger was one of these, and he was wont to offend the Catholics especially by his gross invectives against the festival of Corpus Christi.' In the same place, p. 475: 'The leanings of the lords and knights were at that time (1585) no longer so decidedly to the side of the Protestant clergy, who did more damage by excess of ecclesiastical zeal than the lords and landowners could make good again.'

[2] Peinlich, p. 53, note 151.

[3] Krones, *Gesch. der Universität Graz*, p. 278 ff., where the wealth of specialist literature is carefully detailed. See also Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 478 ff.; *Akten*, p. 585 ff. In consequence of the activity of the Jesuits in Graz, says Loserth (*l.c.* p. 540 ff.), 'affairs there,' since about 1586, 'had become completely reversed.' 'Whereas before, on the occasion of any Church contentions, the originators of the strife were mostly to be

the Archduke in 1574, counted already 200 pupils; the pastoral activity of the Fathers augmented from day to day.[1] In 1585 Charles raised the college to the rank of a university and endowed it richly.[2] It had at first only two faculties—those of philosophy and theology. On November 25, 1586, the name of Ferdinand, eldest son of the founder, was entered in his own handwriting in the album of the University.[3]

The Archduke, in 1580, had repeatedly forbidden parents to send their children to foreign schools, but so far he had not wished to have recourse to punishment.[4] Now, however, he ordered all the inhabitants, 'on pain of heavy disgrace and penalty,' to send their sons to study at the University of Graz. He had resolved, he said in the charter of the institution, 'in

found on the Protestant side, and edict after edict was issued in order to put a stop to the interminable vituperations of the preachers, now the latter are invariably themselves on the defensive.' Loserth cites cases of the oppression of Protestants, and tells how Jesuits invaded Protestant services and schools in order to contradict and deride the pastors; according to the account of the accused Jesuits the proceedings had been of an altogether different nature (*ibid.* p. 542 ff.).

[1] Despatch of the Archduke Charles to Gregory XIII., December, 22 1574, in Theiner, *Annales*, i. 256; cf. Krones, *Gesch. der Universität Graz.* p. 227 ff.

[2] Krones, *Gesch. der Universität Graz*, pp. 7 ff., 236 ff.

[3] *Steiermärkische Zeitschr.*, N.F., 1 Jahrg. Heft ii. 42, and 2 Jahrg. Heft ii. 109. Despatch of Charles to Gregory XIII., in 1584, in Theiner, iii. 535–538. Archduke Ferdinand did not study at the University; he only inscribed his name to do honour to the institution (Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, viii. note 1).

[4] Theiner, iii. 135. Concerning the official intercourse of the province of Styria with the Protestant universities, from which they were supplied with preachers and teachers, and to which they sent their candidates to study, see Loserth, *Die Beziehungen der steiermärkischen Landschaft zu den Universitäten Wittenberg, Rostock, Heidelberg, Tübingen, Strasburg, u. a. in der zweiten Hälfte des 16 Jahrhunderts* (Graz, 1898). The more lively intercourse did not cease till 1598, when the Protestant ministry for school and church government in Styria was abolished by Ferdinand II.

order to secure good training in the liberal arts to the young, and also in view of the public benefit, to provide a means whereby the expense of sending young people to foreign universities and places of study might be saved.'

Since 1581 all posts that had fallen vacant in the administrative council had been filled with Catholics, whereas up till that date the government offices had been for the most part in the hands of Protestants. Since 1586 Church affairs had been under the direction of a committee of Catholic members of the administrative council. In the years from 1586 to 1588 Archduke Charles had been full of the idea of establishing an ecclesiastical council or 'convent council' for Central Austria, on the model of the one instituted in 1567 by Maximilian II. for Upper and Lower Austria, which should have regard chiefly to the discipline of the clergy —above all to the improvement of the decayed discipline of the convents. But the plans for this council-board were not carried into effect.[1]

'The most assiduous and the most devoted patroness of the University, as indeed of the whole work of reviving and propagating Catholic life,' was Charles's staunchly orthodox wife, Maria of Bavaria, one of the most active and industrious women of the time.[2] Naturally of a quick temper, she was, it is true, capable of firing up with passionate excitement,[3] but she held her nature under strict control. In the hospitals she often performed the humblest and most disagreeable offices of a sick-nurse. Once when the hospital matron begged

[1] Loserth, 'Erzherzog Karl und die Frage der Errichtung eines Klosterrates in Innerösterreich;' *Archiv für österr. Gesch.* 84 (1898), pp. 283–379, and his *Reformation*, p. 503 ff.

[2] Hurter, *Erzherzogin Maria*, p. 396 ff.

[3] Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, 15–17. Abt. 2, pp. 115, 157 ff.

her to stay away from a ward where there was a particularly unpleasant smell, Maria answered: 'However bad the smell may be, my sins and yours have even a worse odour before God.' [1] With what great love, coupled at the same time with due strictness, she brought up her children is seen in the letter of the year 1590, when her son Ferdinand, a lad of eleven years old, was to be sent to the Jesuit school at Ingoldstadt, in order that he might grow up in an exclusively Catholic atmosphere. 'I beseech you most earnestly,' she wrote to her brother, Duke William V. of Bavaria, 'to take him under your watchful care; I beg you for the love of God not to give in to him or humour him in any way that is not right; I place my highest trust in you.' 'I cannot express to you in writing how greatly I long for him to be under your guardianship. I entreat you also most fervently to write me the whole truth about him, to tell me how far you are satisfied with him, how far he pleases you, or whatever you think about him, and I should like his governor and tutor to do the same. Keep back nothing from me; write me in plain German all that is in your heart.' 'It gives me such joy that I cannot utter it,' she says in later letters to her brother, 'to hear that you are so well satisfied with him; may God the Lord grant him His grace, that he may be obedient and submissive to you in everything, as he promised me he would. He would have to change greatly to be otherwise, for here he was always obedient in all that was required of him, as his governor will tell you.' [2]

The Archduke Charles expressed special gratitude

[1] Hurter, *Erzherzogin Maria*, p. 393.
[2] Stieve, *Wittelsbacher Briefe*, pp. 37, 39.

to his brother-in-law for allowing his son Maximilian to go to Ingolstadt with Ferdinand. 'If I can do anything in return for your Excellency and yours, I beg of you, do not spare me, for you will find me at all times willing to serve you. I shall also take good care that my Ferdinand does all in his power to requite the services which you and yours have conferred upon him. I have also enjoined on him that he is to obey you in all things; if he does not do so, punish him at once, I beg of you.' [1]

Between Maximilian and Ferdinand there grew up an intimate and firm friendship. In depth and penetration of understanding, in surety of judgment, and in intellectual calibre Ferdinand was far behind his cousin; but not so in genuine piety of disposition, in dutifulness, and in love of learning. His governor wrote of him to William V., in 1590, that he pursued his studies with 'such passion and assiduity' that it was necessary to restrain his zeal; he would not even allow himself time to eat.[2] Two years later one of his instructors said that Ferdinand devoted himself to his studies with the greatest delight, and that in the rest of his conduct he was like an angel.[3] And, again, two years later, on January 25, 1594, the rector of the University, in a letter to the rector of the Jesuits in Graz, said: 'The Archduke Ferdinand has now completed his fourth year of study here, and this, indeed, with no small amount of profit. Nothing withers that is planted in this most fruitful soil. Undoubtedly the young prince's disposition is of such nature that nothing better can be wished.' [4]

[1] v. Aretin, *Maximilian der Erste*, p. 374.
[2] v. Aretin, p. 487. [3] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns.*
[4] Sugenheim, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, i. 130, note 48.

Archduke Charles, who had met with the utmost opposition from the Protestants in his efforts at Catholic restoration, had died on July 10, 1590, when only fifty years old. The Protestants in Graz had fomented a rising, and thereby hastened on his death.[1] In his will he enjoined his successor 'to root out from the land, as much as possible, the pernicious heresies of the sectaries.'[2]

During the Regency, which lasted through the minority of the hereditary prince Ferdinand, the religious struggles continued in Central Austria.[3]

[1] Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 557: 'The prohibition to the sons of burghers in the country to attend Protestant schools within and without Central Austria gave rise in June 1590—a month before the death of the Archduke Charles—to serious tumults in Graz; a "'second Parisian bloody marriage-feast'" was openly threatened. Only this time the victims were to be supplied from the Catholic camp. In very deed, in the summer of 1590, there was not only in Graz, but in other places in all three countries, a sinister atmosphere such as precedes the outbreak of a storm. Just a spark was needed, and the fire-brand would flare up. The cause, however, of this ominous atmosphere lay not so much in the prohibition to attend Protestant schools as in the multitude of tyrannous conditions from which the burghers and the nobles scarcely saw any way of escape.' For the insurrection of the Protestant populace in Graz of June 4, 5, and 6 (according to Loserth it was only 'the mob, not the burgher class'), see Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 561 ff.; *Akten*, p. 685 ff.

[2] Loserth, *Reformation*, p. 571: 'For the Protestants of the land the death of Charles II. might mean a momentary lightening of their burdensome situation; for the Catholics it signified a terrible—indeed the most terrible—loss that could have befallen them. To many people possibly at the time the success he achieved may not have appeared so important as it really was. For there were people who expected still more. But the study of the mass of documentary writings exchanged on Church questions shows incontrovertibly that Protestantism was brought down from the arrogant height it had occupied in the year 1578.' *Ibid.* p. 572: 'All important reforms which Ferdinand II. carried through had been already in part, down to separate details, planned and tested by his father; it was the Bavarian counsels which helped to make the counter-reformation victorious in Central Austria.'

[3] When, on the death of the Archduke Charles, the Archduke Ernest was first appointed Regent, the Protestant Estates of the lands of Central

The final settlement was to take place under the new Archduke. Ferdinand, educated in the strictest Catholic spirit, entered on the government in 1596, with the firm resolve 'not to consent to the least thing which was opposed to the Catholic religion,'[1] and to bring the work of Catholic restoration to a conclusion. Accordingly, when receiving the allegiance of the Estates, he at once refused to make any concessions respecting the free exercise of the Protestant religion.[2]

The encroachments of the Protestants drew from him stern measures of repression. The preachers 'raged to such an extent against everything Catholic that it could no longer be tolerated.' The preacher Fichtmann, in one single sermon, called the Pope sixteen times the Antichrist and the son of perdition.[3] Pamphlets and engravings ridiculing the Pope were circulated abroad.[4] On one occasion when Ferdinand, his mother, and several princes were crossing the Murbrück at Graz, two preachers who met them not only kept their hats on their heads, but actually turned their backs on the Archduke. Every single priest in the provostry of

Austria made another attempt to extort from him a recognition of the Religious Pacification of Bruck, of 1578; they demanded of him, as a condition of their swearing allegiance to him, 'to leave to the country its traditional liberties and also the benefits of the Religious Pacification concluded with the people by the late Archduke Charles.' As the Archduke Ernest could not, of course, agree to this condition, the transactions dragged on till March 1592, and only then did the ceremony of swearing allegiance take place. See Loserth, 'Der Huldigungsstreit nach dem Tode Erzherzog Karls II. 1590–1592,' Graz, 1898 (*Forschungen zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der Steiermark*, 2 Bd. 2 Heft). For the contentions during the Regency of the Archdukes Ernest and Maximilian, 1590–1595, see Ilwof, *Der Protestantismus in Steiermark*, pp. 95–107.

[1] See the opinions in Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, i. 119, notes, and 120, note 2; Huber, iv. 337 ff.

[2] Huber, iv. 338 ff.

[3] Hurter, iv. 2.

[4] *Steiermärkische Zeitschrift*, Neue Folge, Jahrg. ii. 112.

Greich was turned out. At Villach a clergyman who had warned the people against Protestantism was beaten with a stick in the open market-place, and afterwards hunted out of the town. When the Patriarch of Aquileja attempted to take possession of a church that belonged to him, he had great difficulty in escaping from the persecutions of the mob.[1] At Klagenfurt a provost was assaulted with fists and with sticks; and a priest, while offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, was thrown on the ground and trampled under foot. The malefactor, when on his trial, stated that he had acted 'at the instigation of pious, God-fearing people—above all, at the dictation of the Supreme Being.' Women and young girls going on a pilgrimage to a shrine in the neighbourhood of the town were exposed to the most shameful treatment; divine service was disturbed with whistling, the rites and ceremonies were mocked and mimicked, the images polluted. When Ferdinand issued the order that the ringleaders were to be sent to Graz to undergo their merited punishment, the Protestant Estates refused to obey the command, saying that it clashed with their right and liberties. Worse atrocities even than in Carinthia were perpetrated in Styria by the populace, goaded to fury by the preachers. At Eisenerz, for instance, the Catholic pastor was expelled and replaced by a Protestant, and when, by order of Ferdinand, one of his councillors endeavoured to make the burghers desist from their violent measures, the priest was subjected to several hours' jeering and

[1] For this case see Loserth in the *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* 20 (1899), p. 132 ff. (as opposed to Schuster, *Fürstbischof Martin Brenner*, p. 316). The Protestants proceeded thus forcibly against the Patriarch of Aquileja because they considered his act a breach of the public peace, for in their opinion he had no right to the church in question.

mockery, and taken on horseback to the market in a ludicrous procession. George Stobäus, who later on gave an account of all these proceedings to the Archduke Charles, remarked, with justice, that the insolence, audacity, and arrogance of the religious innovators had obliged Ferdinand to interfere in the way he had done.[1] 'It is the will of God,' Ferdinand said, 'that I should complete the restoration of the true faith. Ought I, then, to go on showing indulgence until all my authority is lost, and the Catholic religion has disappeared from my land?'[2]

George Stobäus of Palmburg, Prince-Bishop of Lavant, formerly a pupil of the German College at Rome, a man distinguished by genuine priestly conduct, by strict disinterestedness and fidelity to duty, by eloquence and many-sided culture, and by his encouragement of learning and arts,[3] was the most influential counsellor of Ferdinand, sometime governor of Central Austria. In August 1598, at the Archduke's request, he sent him in a memorandum on the Church question. 'Opinions as to the manner in which the reformation should be carried through are,' he said, 'multitudinous. Some recommend terrorising methods, punishment, imprisonment, if necessary recourse to arms. They justify this advice by appeal to Christ, who drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple with a scourge. People of this sort manifest zeal, but no true insight. Fear is a bad schoolmaster; the issues of war are always uncertain. God desires to be reverenced from free-will, not from compulsion.' On the other hand, he said, Ferdinand

[1] Hansiz, ii. 689, 693–698, 707. [2] Hurter, iv. 35.

[3] Stepischueg, pp. 82 ff., 123–132. See also K. Mayr-Deisinger's article in Zwiedineck-südenhorst's *Zeitschr. für allgemeine Gesch.* (Stuttgart, 1887), iv. 124 ff.

must not attend to those 'poor-spirited politicians' who, from fear of the heretics, advised full indulgence and toleration. 'Are the sectaries, then,' he asked, 'so powerful, and we so impotent, that they can make war on us at their pleasure, while we can oppose no resistance to them? If they were in very truth so superior in strength, would they thus have spared us, and not long since have demolished us? Neither should any importance be attached to the saying so often reiterated by these people that they would rather be the subjects of the Sultan than of a Catholic prince. How mild and beneficent the rule of the Turk is, they know well enough. Christianity would never have been spread over the face of the earth by means of people who saw a scorpion under every stone, an enemy at every city gate, who dreaded heaven's lightning at every turn.' The Protestant princes had everywhere 'interposed their might' on behalf of the new doctrines, whether Lutheran or Calvinist. Let Ferdinand, Stobäus advised, put forward his 'princely authority' in favour of the Catholic Church. 'In so doing there were three steps which must be taken: First, the government of the provinces and the towns must be entrusted to Catholics only; second, none but Catholics must be received as members of the provincial diet; third, a decree must be issued enjoining everybody either to subscribe in writing to the Catholic faith, or else to seek another home where they could live and believe as they liked.' If the Archduke instituted these measures, and at the same time showed himself solicitous for the safety of the land by securing good police regulations and impartial administration of justice, and by making provision against scarcity, the people would be more

willing to submit to his religious enactments. The commencement of the Church measures must be the expulsion from the land of the preachers, 'the noise-mongers,' and first and foremost they must be turned out of Graz, the princely residence. If the burghers and the peasants were no longer inflamed, they would come to their senses of themselves.[1]

In conformity with this memorandum, Ferdinand, on September 18, 1598, gave orders that the preachers were to leave the capital, Graz, and the other towns and boroughs of the principality, within fourteen days. When protestations were raised against the enactment, a second order was issued on September 28 to the effect that 'the preachers must leave Graz before nightfall.' A further decree insisted that 'the patrons of ecclesiastical benefices must, within two months, propose Catholic priests to the bishops for the said benefices. If the term fixed was disregarded, the Prince would act as duty compelled him. A third edict prohibited the carrying on of work during the time of divine service; the reading of sectarian books; the admission of sectaries to the rights of citizenship. The burghers of all the different towns in the principality were to return to the Catholic faith, or else sell their immovable goods, pay an impost of a 'tenth,' and leave the land.[2]

All these enactments caused intense bitterness among the Protestants. In the streets of Graz Catholics were pelted with dirt; their windows were broken in, their

[1] Despatch of Bishop Stobäus 'De auspicanda religionis reformatione in Styria, Carinthia, Carniola,' in Hansiz, ii. 713–720. See Hurter, iv. 44–48; Stepischneg, pp. 106–107, and Krones, *Gesch. der Grazer Universität*, p. 278 ff.

[2] Hurter, iv. 48 ff. Cf. Loserth in the *Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Protestantismus in Österreich*, xxi. 54 ff., 79 ff.

houses were damaged. The mob actually broke into the house of a Spanish ambassador who had come to fetch the Archduchess Margaret, the affianced bride of Philip III., and pursued the ambassador's servants down the street. Ferdinand was obliged to summon military help from Vienna in order to restrain the insurgents and the violators of international right.[1]

When, in 1599, a provincial diet met at Graz, the Protestant Estates of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola declared that they should withhold all Turkish aids unless the religious enactments were cancelled and freedom of worship granted them. Violent language and threats were used. 'We are not subjects,' said the Styrian members of the diet, 'but vassals to whom it is optional whether or no they will give support against an enemy. There are not only enemies of the body, but also enemies of the soul and of the conscience. It is the Jesuits, "the enemies of the eternal truth," who are at the bottom of these measures of the Archduke.' The Carinthian members said: 'Our forefathers submitted themselves to the Prince of Austria from free choice, and we are therefore entitled to choose for ourselves an overlord who shall allow us free exercise of our religion.'[2] The Estates actually

[1] Stobäus, in Hansiz, ii. 723.

[2] Hurter, iv. 193–199. Concerning the lawsuit of 1599 against two officials of the Styrian province, viz. the Central Austrian agent at the imperial court at Prague, Hans Georg Kandelberger, and the Styrian provincial secretary, Hans Adam Gabelkofer, see Loserth, 'Ein Hochverratsprozess aus der Zeit der Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich,' *Archiv für österr. Gesch.* 88 (1900), pp. 313–365. The case ended indefinitely with the final release of the accused persons because no evidence could be brought forward of the existence of a conspiracy 'to expel from the land, and even put to death, Ferdinand II. and his family.' Loserth, however, acknowledges that the case 'as such was mysterious enough,' and that it is not fully cleared up by the documents now at hand. But he does not

held out the threat that in extremity they might well call the Turks to their help.[1]

But Ferdinand did not let himself be intimidated. He possessed the same rights, he said, which the Electors of the Palatinate of Saxony and of Brandenburg had exercised in their expulsion of the Catholics, and the Princes of Bavaria in the expulsion of the Protestants.[2] 'Let him only,' his mother had urged on him, 'show the Estates his teeth in good earnest, and they would soon become amenable.'[3] To the assertion of the Estates that 'they would rather secede from him than from their faith,' Ferdinand answered with the counter-assertion that 'he could more easily be parted from himself than from the resolution to drive out the heretics and to re-establish the Church.' At the end of April he sent the Estates a 'capital resolution,' in which he repudiated their complaints. Their appeal to the Augsburg Religious Peace, he said, was invalid, for the said treaty had been concluded only between the electors and princes, and the immediate imperial Estates, and not between them and their provincial Estates and subjects. 'If this had not been so, and if subjects as well as overlords had been included in the benefits of this Peace, then the Catholics in many principalities and imperial towns would not have been expelled as they had been, nor would the poor people of so many places have been dragged backwards and

allow that there can be any question of crime on the part of Kandelberger (p. 318); and whether the latter 'did perhaps express himself somewhat unguardedly in conversation with the ambassadors of the Protestant Estates at Prague,' cannot be exactly determined by the materials at hand.

[1] Stobäus, in Hansiz, ii. 725.

[2] Stobäus, in Hansiz, ii. 724.

[3] Krones, iii. 343.

forwards in such a lamentable manner from one religion to another.' The Archduke Charles had certainly made concessions to the Estates in matters of religion, but in no way had he made them binding on his heirs. On the contrary, the Acts themselves showed that 'when an attempt was made to induce him to bind the latter down, he had emphatically objected and refused to do so.' Moreover, the Estates and their preachers, even in Charles's lifetime, had 'in many and countless ways exceeded' the concessions made to them. The Archduke's 'own towns, boroughs, and Crown-lands,' which were excluded from his concessions, had been by them (the Protestant Estates) lured away from the true religion and drawn into Protestantism by all manner of cunning wiles. 'The preachers also, despite warnings, commands, and prohibitions, had never desisted from their pulpit attacks on the Catholic heads of Christendom, had never ceased preaching, singing, and praying against them, and slandering and denouncing them as soul murderers, tyrants, and Herods; and they had gone on injuring in every way, in their churches and institutions, all the Catholic feudal lords, bailiffs, and ecclesiastical ordinaries.' When cited before a tribunal they had declared that they were subject to no ruler but God alone. Thus there had remained no alternative for the authorities of the land but to expel these contumacious preachers. The oath sworn by the Archduke on receiving allegiance, 'to preserve the Estates in their rights, liberties, and possessions,' related, as the formula showed, first and foremost to the ancient Catholic college of prelates and to the priesthood, which had been for centuries in possession of their rights and property; 'to the new upstart preachers

who had come into the land of their own accord, who had no ancient established footing in the land, and who would not recognise the Archduke as their lord and reigning prince—to these, Ferdinand declared, he was in no way bound; still less was he bound to protect and tolerate them, against his will, in his own towns, boroughs, and jurisdictions.' The violence with which the Estates had proceeded against the rights and possessions of the Catholics, and 'the heart-breaking manner in which they had made free with the goods of the Church,' were well known everywhere. When the bishops and prelates had appointed pastors in the parishes belonging to them, these clerics had been 'driven out with spears, poles, and muskets, and had been in peril of body and life even inside the churches.' 'It would need a special narrative to recount all the abominable deeds perpetrated by some of the provincial Estates against the priests: to tell how often the latter had been ignominiously flogged, assailed with muskets, wounded, assaulted in processions together with their parishioners, pursued and scattered with the Church banners, not to speak of the tumults, uproars, and shameless atrocities by which so many places had been disgraced on account of religion.' In some towns the Catholics had been excluded from all municipal posts, and nobody could be received as a burgher unless he had first sworn to the Augsburg Confession. 'Nor can it be passed over in silence how it was the custom for the poor Catholics to be taunted or persecuted with words of opprobrium, and with ill-usage by burghers and peasants without distinction.' Those who returned to the old and true Church were denounced as perjured mamelukes, who only wanted to fill their bellies.

Numbers were constrained to migrate from their homes. 'Whether, now, this was a state of things which ought to be tolerated indefinitely, and whether it did not call for inspection and remedy, every reasonable person can judge for himself or herself.' [1]

In a protest against Ferdinand's Resolution, Ehrenreich von Saurau, marshal for the archduchy of Styria, called the Archduke's measures 'awful persecution.' He threatened Ferdinand with opposition from the Venetians, from the imperial Estates, and from Hungary, and pointed to the Swiss and the Dutch as examples.[2] According to this protest, Ferdinand had not been wrong when once before he had written to the Emperor that 'a revolutionary spirit pervaded the land,' and it seemed as if a 'republic after the Swiss and Dutch pattern' was being aimed at.[3] The Archduke's privy councillors wanted the marshal to be put in prison for his insolent language, 'but his Excellency's piety,' writes Khevenhüller, 'bore it all with patience.' When, in the summer of 1601, the nether-Austrian government councillor and provincial delegate, Baron Wolfgang von Hofkirchen, said of Ferdinand, in the presence of several other persons, that he was 'a slave of the Jesuits, a perfectly ignorant man, devoid of all

[1] Hurter, iv. Beil. No. 171, pp. 496–522; S. Huber, iv. 344 ff.; cf. the extract from Ferdinand's '*Religionshauptresolution*' of April 30, 1599, in Loserth, *Die Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich; Jahrb. für Gesch. des Protest. in Österreich*, xxi. 65–69. According to this extract it was also said in the Resolution (p. 68): 'Your princely Grace's milder reformatory process might easily be tolerated, for whereas the lords and their preachers turn their subjects away from Catholic worship, compel them to eat flesh-meat and to desecrate the holy seasons, allow divorce and unbecoming marriages, deprive the bishops of their rights, and thus cause much tumult in the land, your reformation produces temporal and eternal welfare' (Counter-propositions of the Estates of February 24, 1600; *ibid.* p. 69 ff.).

[2] Hurter, iv. 212.

[3] Krones, iii. 339.

understanding, and caring only for bloodshed and tyrannous exercise of power,' the sole punishment he received was dismissal from his service.[1] Instances such as these did not betoken the nature of a Tiberius or a Nero, which the Protestants ascribed to the Archduke.

Matters never came to bloodshed anywhere during the energetic work of Catholic restoration. In October 1599 the 'commissioners' appointed by Ferdinand began their labours in the different districts. They were provided with military escorts, and their business was to drive out the preachers, to do away with the prayer-houses, to burn sectarian books, to appoint Catholic clergymen, and to see that the subjects were obedient to the ruling prince, and that they either adopted the Catholic faith or else left the country within a stated period. Even in Eisenerz, where the archiducal councillor was so abominably used, and where burghers, journeymen, colliers, and charcoal-burners were ready with armed resistance, no bloody combat took place. The people were informed that whosoever was guilty of disturbing the peace, or causing sedition, or in any other way thwarting and opposing the power of the territorial prince, would be counted a traitor and a perjurer, and would have to forfeit house and holding, goods and chattels, body and life. In a few places only did the commissioners encounter serious opposition.[2] 'We could not do less,' Ferdinand wrote

[1] Hurter, iv. 213–214.

[2] Fuller details in Mayer, *Zur Gesch. Innerösterreichs*, p. 508 ff. See also the documents in the *Steiermärkische Geschichtsblätter*, iv. 23 ff. and Peinlich, *Die Gegenreformation zu Graz im Jahre 1600 und Lorenz von Brindisi* (Graz, 1882). Ferdinand's Patent of November 12, 1599, has been published by R. Beck in the *Jahrb. der Gesellsch. für die Gesch. des Protest. in Österr.* xxi. (1900), 85–87.

to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, on April 7, 1601, 'for the satisfaction of our Christian conscience and for the prevention of manifold inconveniences. We were, indeed, constrained and compelled to the course we took. Were we to tell your Grace of all the insults heaped on us by the sectarian preachers and their followers, you would wonder at our patience. We will keep silence respecting the calumnies and punishable slanders poured out daily from the public pulpits against ourselves and against higher Catholic rulers, and we will only complain that the preachers in all our towns and boroughs incited the burghers to disobedience to such an extent that in some places open risings occurred repeatedly, and there was danger of much bloodshed, not to mention the damaging intrigues and attacks which were being matured against us through secret writings and meetings. All this has been caused solely by the inequality in religion and the disobedience resulting therefrom. Things had already come to such a pass that no respect was shown to us, and we were treated as a mere figure-head of a sovereign; and so there was no alternative but to get rid of the originators of the disturbances—viz. the preachers and the foul-mouthed agitators, who were not at all adherents of the Augsburg Confession of A.D. 1530, but split up into many sects, especially as, in their opinion, they were not subjected to any rule, and set more store by the power of our subjects than by our own. But how can they have the face to make such heavy complaints as they do, seeing that not a hair of the heads of the preachers has been ruffled, although we had good cause to proceed to serious measures against those of them who still remain defiantly in the land. As little, too, do we

consider that we have shown such great injustice to our subjects, seeing that it was open to each one of them to migrate. This migrating, indeed, is more disadvantageous to us than to those who have left, for they were almost all of them the wealthiest of the inhabitants, and they took a great deal of money out of the country. For these and many other reasons that might be alleged on the strength of the Roman Imperial Recess, we were fully justified in carrying out this salutary reformation, and, far from having exhibited harshness and severity, we had recourse only to mildness and gentle measures. As regards parallel instances we are aware that, within the Empire, protesting princes have proceeded on far harsher lines.' [1]

'Mildness and gentle measures' may have lain in the intentions of Ferdinand, but his commissioners, on the contrary, 'had recourse in many places to exceptional violence.' As before, large numbers of Catholic churches and parsonages had been destroyed and laid waste by the Protestants, so now 'in many cases the sectaries were paid back in their own coin, and Mr. Omnes (the mob) again had his finger in the pie as much as before,' and that 'much to the sorrow of good Catholics, who, out of Christian love, did not want to plot revenge.' [2] Thus, for instance, in the Protestant

[1] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 556, note 2. It was intended that the letter should be communicated to the Margrave of Ausbach.

[2] 'Peace be with you!' a sermon at the Holy Easter festival by Wolfgang Huber (1603), Bl. 2. It is only to 'good Catholics' such as these that the words of Stobäus, in a despatch of the year 1604 to the Archduke Charles, are applicable: 'they did indeed rejoice at Ferdinand's persistence, but no harsh word against their opponents was ever heard from them, still less, however tempting this may be, any threat or any vow of vengeance; but, on the contrary, words of compassion and of prayer to God for their soul's salvation' (Hansiz, ii. 706).

church at Scharfenau, near Cilli, 'the proceedings were so piteous' that, according to a Protestant report, 'even the papists themselves, both men and women, who were looking on, were deeply distressed, and wept bitterly.' Part of the church was blasted with gunpowder, and the preacher's dwelling-place was mercilessly demolished.[1]

After the lapse of a few years the Catholic restoration was accomplished in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. The nobles were allowed to retain their Protestant creed, but were not allowed public exercise of their religion. One preacher only, Heisinger by name, underwent severe punishment. In spite of Ferdinand's orders he had preached openly, and had given himself out as a prophet sent by God. He called the Emperor and the Archduke servants of the devil, tyrants, and idolaters, and proclaimed the downfall of all papists, to be followed soon after by the Day of Judgment. Whereas repeated warnings had no effect on him, he was thrown into prison, and both he and his wife, who had given vent to similar abusive utterances, were condemned to death.[2]

[1] Mayer, pp. 514–516.

[2] Stobäus, in Hansiz, ii. 704. The Catholic restoration did not succeed so rapidly in Carinthia and Carniola as in Styria; see Huber, iv. 348 ff.; N. Lebinger, 'Reformation und Gegenreformation in Klagenfurt' (*Progr. des Gymnasiums zu Klagenfurt*, 1868), 27 ff., and Dimitz, *Gesch. Krains*, iii. 296 ff., 309 ff., 331 ff. Concerning the monograph of Schuster, see above, p. 380, note 1. Loserth, in reviewing Leop. Schuster's *Fürstbischof Martin Brenner* (Graz, 1898), *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* xx. (1899), 124–136, attributes to this book a tendency to partisanship, while for his own book, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, he claims real objectivity, because 'his task was not to write an apology but a history.' It does not seem to occur to him that his collective writings on the counter-reformation are nothing more than 'an apology' for the proceedings of the Protestant nobility, in which, in order to ward off all blame from the nobles, he inclines here and there to let an unfavourable light fall on the

The bishops Martin Brenner of Seckau and Thomas Crön of Laibach had been Ferdinand's most active collaborators. 'Carinthia was reformed precisely in the same way as Styria,' wrote Brenner to Markus Fugger, at Augsburg, on November 21, 1600. 'First of all the churches of the sectaries, together with the churchyards and the habitations of the preachers, were everywhere destroyed, partly with battering-rams, partly with powder; the preachers themselves were expelled from the whole province. Contrary to all expectation, the work, thank God, has been everywhere successfully carried through, and without any blood-shed. The heretics spread reports of all sorts of robbery by our soldiers and of tyranny practised on the people by our commissioners; but they were one and all false, lying inventions, which should vanish into nothingness without its being necessary for us to show proofs of our innocence.' [1] The Bishop of Laibach, friend and patron of the Jesuits, for whom he founded a college in his residential town, accomplished such enormous results by his untiring activity, that in *one* year he brought back 40,000 Protestants to the Church. At the consecration of the Capuchin Church of Laibach there were 20,000 people present.[2] After the external process of Catholic restoration had been accomplished by the reform commissioners, it was the Jesuits and the Capuchins who were the chief agents in effecting the

preachers. 'Under these circumstances, which are manifest to all eyes, it certainly does not become him to characterise as biassed the opinion of a Catholic historian differing from his own.

[1] '. . . omnia ea cum sint falsissima et mendacia, per sese evanescere soleant, nulla pro innocentiae nostrae declaratione Apologia opus erit' (in Chmel, *Handschriften*, i. 432).

[2] Hurter, iv. 13–17.

inward conversion of the people; they performed this work with zeal and self-sacrifice that are unparalleled. 'There is no question that the Jesuits were the creators in Klagenburg of a new Catholic religious life springing from inward conviction. By instruction, by prudence, and by perseverance, they brought about in the space of forty years such a complete revolution in the religious feeling of the inhabitants that whereas the latter had before been distinguished by their zeal for Protestantism, they now became most ardent followers of Catholicism.'[1] These devoted labourers were specially energetic in the field of instruction and education. At Klagenfurt, where they opened a gymnasium in 1605, the number of their pupils grew in six years to 300 or 360; in three more years to 500, and afterwards to 750; one new 'chair' after another had to be established.[2] At Graz the number of Jesuit pupils rose gradually from 1,100 to 1,200.[3]

For the conversion of the lower classes of the people, the poorest of all the religious orders, that of the Capuchins, laboured indefatigably. In the short period from 1600 to 1615, settlements of these true lovers of the people were formed in Graz, Bruck, Cilli, Marburg, Radkersburg, Pettau, and Laibach.[4] The Protestants laid the blame of the counter-reform measures in the several Catholic districts indiscriminately on the Jesuits,

[1] Pronouncement of Lebinger in the treatise quoted at p. 412, note 2; pp. 46–47.

[2] *Kärntner Zeitschr.* vi. 151; cf. Hurter, ii. 14.

[3] *Litterae annuae, ad a. 1618 and 1619*, in the Viennese Court Library, MS. no. 13563, pp. 8, 13.

[4] Huber, iv. 352. In the Salzburg district also, the Archbishop Marx Sittich of Hohenembs had summoned Capuchins as missionaries in the year 1613. See Loserth, 'Die Gegenreformation in Salzburg,' *Mitteil. des Instit. für österr. Gesch.* xix. (1898), 678 ff.

and monstrous reports concerning them were circulated among the people. The publishers of 'Neun Predigten von dem greulichen Blutbade der Kinder zu Bethlehem' ('Nine sermons on the horrible massacre of the children at Bethlehem'), delivered at Meissen by the Superintendent Gregorius Strigentius, reminded the people that:

Durchs Blut die Kirch gegründet ist,
Auch zugenommen zu jeder Frist.
Ohn Blutvergiessen wird's nicht abgehn,
Wenn's um die Welt wird sein geschehn.

The Church was founded by blood,
And its every epoch is marked by blood.

'That this is so everyday experience shows even to the present time. Wherever our Lord God builds and plants His Church and causes the light of the holy Gospel to arise, there persecution and bloodshed, such as many pious Christians experienced some years ago in Carinthia, cannot be avoided. And so it will be until the day of judgment; for Thy sake we are put to death all the day long.' 'Nowadays,' said this preacher, after delivering himself concerning the impious Jezebel, 'nowadays the Jesuits and papists boast of the way in which they have exterminated the Lutheran heretics in Styria and Carinthia.'[1] 'Is there anyone,' said a Styrian preacher posing as an 'exile of Christ,' 'who does not know of the fiendishly cruel and murderous counsels which were given by the Jesuits at Graz, and which caused such streams of blood to flow among the believers in the unadulterated Gospel?' 'Who does not know how cruelly and inhumanly they acted at

[1] *Infanticidium Bethlehemiticum* or *Neun Predigten* &c. (Leipzig, 1611 Bl. 1[b], pp. 71, 175, 178.

Würzburg, and how the Bavarian princes became as it were their house-slaves, for these saintly Jesuits were determined to be sole rulers in everything? Daily they dinned into the Emperor's ears that he ought to institute a general massacre of all the evangelicals, while they themselves persistently murder with dagger, poison, and what not. They mean to overturn the whole Roman Empire and drown it in its own blood. O thou poor Roman Empire! The Jesuits are thine and the Emperor's and every pious German's sole enemies.'[1]

[1] *Der Jesuwider und Suiten wahrhaftige Abmalung von einem Exul Christi zuvörderst aus Lauingen, sodann aus Graz* (1608), pp. 7, 14.

CHAPTER XIX

POSITION OF THE EMPIRE IN 1603—THE IMPERIAL COURT AT PRAGUE

SHORTLY before the close of the Ratisbon Diet, at which the Palatine revolutionary party had achieved such great triumphs,[1] Archduke Matthias had described the position of affairs in a letter to the Emperor on June 26, 1603. 'After this,' he wrote, 'revision will be insisted on in every single case of decision by the Imperial Chamber, and the Turkish subsidies will be given or refused at pleasure, and it will not only be difficult to get contributions in advance on the grant of the Diet, and perilous to begin levying troops on the strength of these, but the Imperial Chamber will lose its whole prestige, if it does not altogether collapse; the Estates of both religions will be plunged in the most serious quarrels with each other; the stronger ones will demolish the weaker ones, and all manner of extensive leagues and conspiracies will be organised in the Empire. A fire will be kindled in Germany, the flames of which will be gladly fanned by many foreigners who have long been waiting their opportunity. Meanwhile the imperial lands will fall into the hands of the Turks, because the Estates of the Empire, engrossed in providing for their own defence, are no longer in a position to help the Fatherland. Therefore it is urgently necessary to

[1] See above, p. 291.

confer at once as to the best means for obviating these dangers.' [1]

The means which Matthias proposed to this end were as follows: (1) That the peaceably disposed members of the Catholic and Protestant Estates should be persuaded by the Emperor to pledge themselves reciprocally to the maintenance of the Religious Peace, and to organise 'a certain system' among themselves for affording prompt support to all verdicts and decrees by which the Imperial Court of Justice, so long as the obstruction of the Imperial Chamber lasted, should give protection to the obedient and oppose resistance to the disobedient. (2) That the Emperor should increase the strength and authority of this Court of Justice in order to fit it for its work. (3) That he should conclude peace with the Turks in order that he might be freer to use his power within the Empire.[2]

The Emperor, a prey to disease, was not to be moved to any kind of action. He did not even give any answer to the memorandum which the ambassadors of the ecclesiastical members of the council of princes had sent in to the Archduke at Ratisbon.[3]

The ecclesiastical Electors had not given their delegates plenary power to sign this memorandum; but they too became convinced that a resolute combination of the Catholic Estates was necessary in order to prevent the complete annihilation threatened them by the revolutionary party. Their councillors, who assembled at a Diet at Mayence in September 1603, agreed unanimously that the behaviour and the statements of the 'corresponding members' at the last meeting of deputies and at Ratisbon leaves no

[1] Stieve, ii. 692–693. [2] Stieve, ii. 692–693. [3] See above, p. 291.

doubt that their aim was to overthrow the Religious Peace and the public peace, and the whole constitution of the Empire, to confiscate all Church property, and to exterminate the Catholic faith all over Germany; they will neither tolerate any judge nor submit to the decisions of a majority, they threaten the Emperor with armed resistance, and they make no secret of the fact that they are leagued together both among themselves and with foreign countries. There is, therefore, no alternative left to the Catholic Estates but to protect themselves by means of a defensive league. Whereas, however, a league of this sort, to which loyal Protestant Estates would also be admitted, would have no other object than the preservation of the imperial constitution, the Emperor should be solicited himself to invite its formation and to prescribe the manner of its organisation. An address to Rudolf on this subject was drafted, and towards the end of October it was passed and sent off by the ecclesiastical electors at an assembly at Coblentz.

It had no result whatever.

No further negotiations were carried on, for the Elector of Mayence, Schweikart von Cronberg, the successor of Adam von Bicken, who had died in January 1604, entertained the fear that the formation of the league in question would incite the 'corresponding' Estates to begin a civil war. Schweikart had been educated in the German college of the Jesuits at Rome, and was faithfully attached to the Church; but he, like the pupil of the Jesuit Metternich in 1591,[1] was of opinion that by friendly intercommunication and negotiations the hostile party might be brought to renounce

[1] See above, pp. 145, 186.

their plans. On no account would he give his consent to anything which might give offence to the Emperor or to the loyal Lutherans.[1]

The Emperor, whose mental illness was making uninterrupted progress, persisted as before in utter inertia. How matters stood at the court of Prague had already been related to Duke Maximilian in the autumn of 1601 by the Bavarian ambassador, Otto Forstenheuser. The Emperor, he said, never let himself be seen in public, and gave audience to no ambassadors; everything had to be handed in in writing. Among the councillors each one pursued his own policy. 'Ever since I have been here I have observed that each one does what he likes. There is, moreover, no longer any fixed hour for the privy councillors to meet together, and the solicitations of the delegates and ambassadors are therefore quite uncertain. If one calls on them at their own houses, these gentlemen are generally out, some of them paying their court to ladies, others taking drives.' The privy councillor Barvitius, to whom the Emperor was more accessible than to anyone else, said to the ambassadors: 'We live from day to day, and we do not know how soon everything may be turned topsy-turvy.'[2]

[1] Fuller details in Stieve, ii. 679–688. In his principality, however, Johann Schweikart carried on the work of Catholic restoration begun by his predecessor, Adam von Bicken. Fuller details on this subject will shortly be given from a work by Dr. J. Schmidt, entitled *Die katholische Restauration in den ehemaligen kurmainzer Grafschaften Königstein und Rieneck* and in my own work *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssen's Geschichte des deutschen Volkes.* This work of Catholic restoration falls in the years 1602–1606, and concerns the new Prussian localities, Königstein, Oberursel, Weisskirchen, and so forth, in the neighbourhood of Frankfort-on-the-Main, as well as the new Bavarian places: Lohr, Frammersbach, and so forth, between Aschaffenburg and Würzburg.

[2] Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, pp. 152–153, cf. 110–111; Hurter, *Philipp Lang*, 19 ff. p. 168.

The *employés* at the Imperial Court had it all their own way, and 'their behaviour was utterly abominable, and disgraceful in the extreme.' 'The lacqueys, painters, alchemists, distillers, and suchlike people,' wrote the Archduke Matthias, 'rule the land, and have the entry of the audience-chamber; even the Emperor's brothers have to bend before them.'[1] At first the valet, Hans Popp, was 'the apple of Rudolf's eye';[2] then Jerome Machowsky, a venomous foe of the Catholics, gained the chief influence until he was ousted by a former Tyrolese Jew, Philip Lang, who surpassed him in every kind of shamelessness.[3] 'Everyone thought himself lucky,' wrote the court chaplain, Alexander Mainardi, 'if he could bask in the sunshine of Lang's favour,' and a foreign messenger at the court said: 'If I have secured Lang, I have secured the Emperor and his councillors; if not, I am nowhere.'[4] The highest princes of the Empire almost went down on their knees to beg the favour of this valet, and gave him presents of all sorts. Lang had it in his power to give away the most important posts of court and State: even appointments and promotions in the army passed through his hands; for bribes he set prisoners free, interposed in the course of justice, annulled imperial decrees and sentences. 'Side by side with the Emperor,' it was said, 'the King of the Jews reigned in the Empire.' He robbed the imperial treasury and art museum, transferred to his own kitchen the choicest game, wild birds and tame birds, destined for the Emperor's table, and held banquets of up to a hundred guests. His

[1] Hurter, *Philipp Lang*, p. 25. [2] See above, p. 176, note 3.

[3] Stieve, *Verhandlungen über die Nachfolge*, p. 78, note 255; Hurter, *Philipp Lang*, 19 ff., 168.

[4] Hurter, *Philipp Lang*, p. 175; cf. Chlumecky, i. 347, note.

insatiable greed of possession and of enjoyment was not less notorious than his openly immoral life. And yet he retained the Emperor's full favour for a long spell of years. 'Whatever I wish for,' he used to be heard saying, 'is bound to come to pass, though all the fiends of hell were against it.' The suspicion rested on him that he also 'harboured dark thoughts of poison and secret assassinations,' and that he had been carrying on a lucrative correspondence respecting the rebel Bocskay in Transylvania and Hungary.[1]

[1] All full details in Hurter; cf. especially pp. 73 ff., 133 ff., 156 ff., 166, 174. His own property, pp. 182–188. He died in prison in 1610. Even the Emperor's stove-heater seems to have been a person whom great lords made use of as an intermediary with Rudolf. (Chlumecky, i. 307.)

CHAPTER XX

THE CALVINIST REBELLION IN HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA, AND THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY IN THE EMPIRE—1604–1606

THE magnates in Hungary had always resented the Habsburg yoke. They did not want to be subject to any 'foreign' lord: above all, they could not tolerate any orderly government. This alone, said the Venetian ambassadors, was the real cause of their opposition to the German royal house. The dominion which the nobles exercised over the people was of so tyrannous a nature that the peasants themselves thought bondage to Turkey would be light in comparison. Terrible decay of morals was universal; between the Christian and the Turkish robbers and plunderers scarcely any difference was observable; they resembled each other in dress, in manner of life, and in customs. A large number of the magnates were in league with the Turks, and were trying under the cloak of religion 'to rid themselves of German dominion.' When in 1586 the Archbishop of Kalocsa established two Jesuit settlements in Hungary, the Calvinists among the Estates refused to pay taxes. After the conquest of Erlau by the Turks in 1596 the Bishop and chapter had withdrawn into the royal free city Kaschau, and had obtained from the Imperial Court of Justice the decision that the church of St. Elisabeth, which had been seized

by the Protestants fifty years before, should be made over to them. When this imperial order was executed in January 1604, the Calvinists, at a provincial diet at Pressburg in the following February, insisted that their right to freedom of religion must be established constitutionally, and their possession of their churches must be guaranteed to them. As they did not succeed in getting these resolutions passed, they dispersed, entering a protest against every measure of the Emperor which was likely to be unfavourable to the position of their creed and their churches. Thereupon Rudolf II. renewed all the laws which had been enacted by former Hungarian kings for the protection of the Catholic religion, and held out the prospect of the severest punishment to all and any who, under whatever pretext, should introduce religious grievances into public political transactions. The Archbishop of Kalocsa received the order to remove the Protestant preachers, who were mostly Calvinists, from all the towns of the district of Zips. In Upper Hungary, where the imperial general John James Belgioioso governed despotically both in Church and in secular matters, a formidable insurrection broke out; at its head was the magnate Valentin Homonnay, 'a pillar' of the Calvinists.

The insurgents made common cause with the magnate Stephan Bocskay of Transylvania. With the declaration that he meant 'to defend "the true religion" and the Hungarian Empire against the Germans,' Bocskay penetrated into Upper Hungary. The Turks also were to help in the defence of the true religion. Bocskay concluded a treaty with them in 1604, and was recognised as Grand Prince of Transylvania and King of Hungary under the suzerainty of the Sultan. The

Turks took possession of the fortress of Gran, the most important conquest which the imperial army had made. In Hungary, wrote Melchior Klesl later on concerning this insurrection, 'there are numbers of people who have no religion at all, numbers who never pray, numbers of Arians and Manichæans, and Calvinists and such like without end. Bocskay gave two reasons for the rebellion: the one, to propagate the heresies which he dignified with the name of the Evangel; the other to wrest the government from the Germans. Whereas God and conscience, he said, had no place anywhere there, they had allied themselves with the Turks and taken them as their protectors; they had become such close friends that they actually intermarried; worst of all, they had sold the Germans, their own nation, to the Turks, so that in the Bocskay insurrection 80,000 souls had been led across the bridges at Griechisch-Weissenburg to Constantinople, not to speak of all who had gone by other passes out of Hungary into Turkey.' [1]

Everywhere the insurgents were victorious. Bocskay's hordes poured over the Austrian and Moravian frontiers, spreading devastation all around, and perpetrating the most horrible acts of barbarity. At the Imperial Court there was ground for fear that in the other hereditary lands also the Protestants would join themselves to Bocskay, for in 1603 the Protestant Estates had already refused 'to let their regiments be enrolled by order and in the name of his Imperial Majesty;' the captain of their troops had sent back to the Emperor 'his appointment and his commission without leyving men.'

Risings were even feared at Vienna and at Prague.

[1] Hammer, iii.; *Urkundensammlung*, p. 661.

'The town is so full of sinister reports, murders, and other catastrophes,' wrote Johann Manhart from Prague to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria on June 20, 1605, 'that verily everyone needs to keep a sharp look-out, more especially the Germans.' For instance, a heretic hacked the face of a Jacobite, who was going to church, with a naked sword; 'the people saw it all, but they only laughed.' 'The state of things among us,' wrote, almost simultaneously, the imperial Field-Marshal Hermann Christoph Rusworm to the Duke from Prague, 'is in truth very strange, and to human understanding there is little hope of improvement. The enemies increase daily in numbers, and the adjacent frontiers are only defended by peasants.' Among the military commanders all was strife and contention. 'It is a judgment of God,' said Count Hans Ambros von Thurn on June 11 in a letter from Vienna to the nuncio at Graz, Hieronymus of Portia, 'that the leaders from the greatest to the smallest are not united, nor in agreement one with the other.' [1]

[1] Fuller details in Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 85–97; Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 71 ff.; Stieve, ii. 718 ff.; Stauffer, pp. 117 ff., 145–160. 'I am informed confidentially and positively from Prague,' wrote Duke Maximilian to the Elector Ernest of Cologne, 'that affairs in Hungary are unfortunately in such a condition, and the management of business at the Imperial Court is of such a nature that his Majesty is not only in danger of losing his kingdom and hereditary lands, but also that the nearest adjoining circles and principalities, indeed nearly the whole Empire, are likely to be ruined. But, notwithstanding all this, there is no sign at court that this evident and crying danger is recognised, or that sufficient attention is given to averting it; with the exception of one single regiment, no troops are being levied; there is no money forthcoming to pay the old regiments or to form new ones, still less does his Majesty dream of giving anything of his own. Moreover, how great soever the danger be, none of the generals, of whom there are a goodly number at court, are ever consulted; but the chamber-lacqueys manage the affairs of war, and appoint those who give them the largest bribes' (Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 47; cf. 48).

The invalid Emperor, a slave to his valet Lang, was 'utterly averse to all exertion of a serious nature,' and was repeatedly a prey to 'fresh attacks of madness.' It was in vain that the Archdukes urged on him that the loss of Hungary and Transylvania would be followed by that of the Empire, that the entire dominion of the House of Habsburg was threatened. They implored him once for all to settle the question of the succession and to make over the government of Hungary to his brother Matthias under the title of Viceregent. Rudolf would not agree to anything, and forbade any repetition of such suggestions in future, saying that he considered them 'insults to himself.' At meals he several times openly called Matthias a scoundrel, and he did all he could to incense everybody against him.[1] In one point, however, the Emperor did yield, for on May 28, 1605, he conferred on the Archduke Matthias plenary power in the management of Hungarian military affairs, and in negotiations with Bocskay.[2]

On June 23, 1606, peace was concluded with the representatives of Bocskay at Vienna, and on November 11 with the Turks at Zsitva-Torok. Transylvania and eight counties of East Hungary were to be ceded to the rebel Bocskay for his lifetime; the Sultan was to retain all that his troops had hitherto conquered, and to receive besides a present of 200,000 florins. Scarcely a quarter of the Hungarian Transylvanian lands was left to the Emperor,[3] and Central Austria, by the loss of the most important frontier-fortresses, stood defenceless against future attacks. Rudolf, it is true, ratified

[1] The account given by Matthias; see Hurter, v. 110–111.

[2] When Matthias received the document he found that it was not couched *in forma*. What the omissions were we are not told (Stieve, ii. 737).

[3] Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 82.

both these treaties of peace, but in secret records he declared that necessity alone had compelled him to do so, and that, therefore, he did not consider his signature binding.[1]

In the Treaty of Vienna the Hungarian Estates had been granted free exercise of their religion; but the Catholic clergy, together with their churches, were to be left unmolested. The Calvinist Estates of Hungary, however, were not satisfied with mere freedom. They refused to sign the treaty until the clause which protected the Catholic Church and Church property, not to speak of other articles, had been removed. The magnate Stephen Illeshazy, who had been specially influential in the settlement of the treaty of peace, began an attack on the ecclesiastical possessions. He took possession of the revenues of the Primate, and the latter was consequently compelled to apply to the King of Spain for a year's income. 'Many of the ecclesiastical Estates,' said the Archduke Matthias in 1608, 'have been reduced, through robbery of their incomes and withdrawal of all succour, to wandering in misery outside the Fatherland; they have not even the means of subsisting till the next diet.'[2]

The rebellion in Transylvania and Hungary gave the revolutionary party in the Empire new courage and hope in the realisation of their plans. The Palatines thought that the time had now at last come when by means of an extensive league of the Protestant princes with England, Holland, Denmark, and France, the

[1] Stieve, ii. 806–808; Hurter, v. 105, note 182, and also Stieve, ii. 816, note 7; Huber, iv. 467 ff., 470 ff., 480, where it is emphatically stated, with regard to the peace with the Turks, that it was not so unfavourable as must appear at first sight. See also Klopp, i. 40.

[2] Hurter, v. 115–116.

work of remodelling the imperial constitution might be begun, and the overweening power of the House of Habsburg be demolished.

At the transactions for the formation of a league in 1603, it had been decided that at Heidelberg 'a perpetual council should be established, to which the general affairs of religion and of the Empire should be submitted for deliberation.' In March of the following year the Palatines brought forward a detailed scheme for the institution of a general council of this sort. It was proposed that side by side with the ambassadors of the 'corresponding' princes the imperial cities and the Counts of Wetterau, and also the States-General of Holland should each be represented by one ambassador. This general council, whose president was to be chosen from among the Palatine Electors, would have to attend to all the affairs of the Estates, 'also to the preservation and promotion of satisfactory relations among the Estates and their neighbours, and between the latter and foreign potentates.' [1]

Chief among these potentates to be reckoned with was Henry IV. of France, whose policy was persistently directed towards 'getting rid of the Habsburg House.' Benjamin Buwinkhausen, the Würtemberg ambassador at the French court, wrote to his Lord on February 26, 1603: 'I cannot think otherwise, from all the intrigues going on here, than that the King is trying by all possible ways and means to stir up the Protestant princes against the House of Austria, to which he is causing trouble in all directions.' [2]

A union of these princes was likely 'greatly to

[1] In the *Nachtrab Anhaltischer Cantzley* A., pp. 2–4; Londorp, i. 2–3.
[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 376.

facilitate Henry's plans.' In the year 1602 he had entered into negotiations concerning this union with the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse,[1] and in the following year he had expressed to the latter his regret that the business—'so necessary for the well-being of the princes'—had not been settled at a meeting at Heidelberg.[2] In July 1605 he urged the Landgrave anew to work zealously for the organisation of the anti-Habsburg union, and promised him his help in the matter.[3] Moritz was so active in his exertions on behalf of France that Henry said of him in a letter to Sully: 'Every day he procures me fresh friends, allies, and trustworthy servants.'[4]

The object of the Palatines was to use the insurrection in Transylvania and Hungary for 'the laudable purpose of evangelical liberty.' According to their intentions the Protestants only were to negotiate with Bocskay and the Turks, not the Emperor and the Catholic Estates. At Heidelberg the idea was actually entertained of transferring Hungary to the Palatine House. 'Hungary could not endure the House of Austria,' and the public weal must be considered before the interests of this house; 'a Count Palatine had already once before been King of Hungary.' If the Elector of Brandenburg, said the Count Palatine's councillor, Michael Löfenius, fell in with this idea, it must be seen 'whether or no it would be possible to bring matters to this issue, even if Saxony did not approve.'[5]

[1] See above, p. 278. [2] *Berger de Xivrey*, vi. 50.

[3] '. . . et y contribueray de mon costé les devoirs et offices d'un bon voisin' (in *Berger de Xivrey*, vi. 476).

[4] Rommel, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 269, note 248.

[5] Protocol of the diet held with Würtemberg at Bretten on March 22,

The Elector Christian II. of Saxony would on no account agree to the Palatine plans. Although he believed that the Hungarian disturbances were the result of religious persecution, Bocskay was, nevertheless, in his eyes a rebel against the Emperor; he was a tool in the hands of the Turks and was not 'concerned about religions, but about the "regions."'[1] 'Persons of note,' Christopher of Waldburg wrote to the Palatine Elector in May 1606, 'officers high in command, and withal of evangelical persuasion, who had had part in Bocskay's insurrection, asserted that it had originated without legitimate cause. Bocskay, who is shedding the blood of the Christians, and delivering over their children to the Turks, hides his own covetous aims under the guise of religion. It is intolerable to a German heart to see how he makes the Germans loathed and despised in Hungary, and how fiercely he rages in the lands of the Emperor. The children are fastened together on horses' backs and galloped off with; those who fall off are left lying on the ground, dead or half dead, and picked up by the German troops. This man has worked more evil in one year than the Turks in their long war.'[2]

Frederic IV., however, took Bocskay under his protection, and threw all the blame on the Pope and the Jesuits. The latter, he said, must be banished from the realm as sedition-mongers, and their goods confiscated. On March 3, 1606, he laid before the Elector of Brandenburg the draft of an address to the Emperor in

1605; Letters of Frederic IV. to Kurbrandenburg April 4 and 23, to Neuburg April 13, in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 431–434, 436–439, 443–444.

[1] Letter to the Count Palatine, June 8, 1606, in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 453.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 492.

which complaint was made to Rudolf of the peril of the Empire. The Pope, his nuncio and his adherents, it was stated, had brought about the insurrection in Hungary and Transylvania by their persecution of the evangelical religion; in the Empire also a rising was to be feared on account of the growing oppression of the evangelicals. In order to avert this danger a treaty of religious peace, which would satisfy all parties, must be concluded for Germany, Hungary, and Transylvania. The Elector of Brandenburg should endeavour to win over Christian II. also to join in this treaty.[1]

'The terrible intrigues of the Pope and of the popish powers' had already, some years before, been 'revealed' to the Elector and to other Protestant Estates by the Italian Brocardo Baronio, a disreputable adventurer, who perambulated Switzerland, France, and Germany. In a *Vermahnung an die evangelischen Fürsten* he had said that 'he had been brought out of the abominable darkness of the papacy into the bright light of the holy evangel, and had been awakened by the special providence and decree of God Almighty to make known to all the world the crafty intrigues of the devil and the Roman Antichrist and all popish princes against the evangelical religion.' That which he recounted, he said he had heard with his own ears from the mouth of the Pope and the discourses of the cardinals; he had also seen and gathered it all from 'the writings, seals, and signatures' of the papal princes. At the instigation of Pope Clement VIII. a great league had been organised for the bloody massacre of the heretics. The Emperor, the King of Spain, the Archdukes Albert and Ferdinand, the Dukes of Bavaria

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 476–477.

and Lorraine—in short, all the Catholic princes, except the King of France and the Grand Duke of Tuscany, had already subscribed to it, and preparations were on foot for beginning 'the holy war.' The Dukes of Bavaria and Archduke Ferdinand were especially zealous for the bloody extirpation of the evangelicals. With consent of the Emperor it had been decided, at an assembly at Rome in January 1602, that Jesuits should be maintained in all the imperial cities for the purpose of entrapping the evangelicals: spies were already traversing Germany, the Netherlands, and England. The ecclesiastical Electors of Mayence and Cologne had expressed to the Pope the hope that the evangelicals in the Empire would begin to fly at each others' throats, in which case the Roman religion could easily be introduced. This adventurer called God to witness that all the intrigues of which he had spoken were actual matters of fact. The evangelical princes should form a league to oppose them; the Germans must be taught 'that they are brothers, that is to say destroyers and exterminators of tyrants, protectors of freedom, and rulers of the world, and that they will not suffer that masked, hooded devil the Pope and a few craven, indolent popish princes, thus insolently to mock and despise the valiant, chivalrous Germàn nation.' [1]

Frederic IV. used the same sort of means as Brocardo Baronio to incense the Protestants against Rome. In April 1606 he sent round to the Duke of Würtemberg

[1] In Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 891-898. Concerning Brocardo Baronio, see Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, i. 243 and ii. 11; *Briefe und Akten*, i. 305-306, 308-310; Stieve, ii. 574 ff. Very important contributions to the characterisation of this adventurer are supplied by the letters of the pro-rector of the University of Wittenberg and of the court preacher to the Count of Lippe, of the year 1604, in Londorp, i. 898-899.

and other Estates, and also to the Protestant communities in Poland, a pamphlet composed by one of his court councillors, Löfenius,[1] under the title of *Warnung an alle christliche Obrigkeit wider des Papstes Praktiken.* In it it was said that the Pope wanted to be supreme over all Christian rulers in secular matters also, and to establish a universal papal and Spanish dominion. In concert with the Jesuits he granted everybody the right to use violence in exterminating the heretics; it was even imposed on subjects as a duty to rise in rebellion against heretical rulers. The evangelical princes of Germany were also threatened with 'murderous plots,' and must therefore join with all the other evangelical powers to prepare for defence, and in spite of their differences of creed they should unite closely together against the sanguinary designs of the Pope and the Jesuits. To prove these designs, Löfenius brought forward all sorts of detached phrases and remarks from the canon law and from Catholic theologians and writers which he quoted apart from their context and in a perverted sense.

He managed to prove whatever he wished. In the domain of politics he showed that the Emperor was subject to the judicial authority of the Palatine Elector,[2] in that of theology he established, by passages from Latin documents, that 'the idolatry of the papists did not stop short at the veneration of the Host or of the dead, of images and pictures; but that they had also ascribed divine honour to the Pope by their genuflexions and prostrations, and by kissing his feet.'[3]

[1] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 128, note 3. The pamphlet appeared anonymously.

[2] See above, p. 270.

[3] In his *Antiphilippika* of 1608 (see Stieve, ii. 919) in Goldast, *Politische Reichshändel*, p. 635.

The manner in which he misrepresented may be seen, for instance, in his remarks on the notorious picture by the Jesuits of Prague in the year 1585.[1] The Jesuits, he says, in this painting have depicted the way in which the Emperor, the King of Spain, the Archdukes of Austria and the Duke of Bavaria ought to 'attack, suppress, and massacre with all manner of hostile weapons, muskets, bows, spears, &c., those Estates of the Holy Empire' whom the Jesuits declared to be heretical.[2]

'The lying, calumniating, libellous lampoons published against the Jesuits and the Catholics of all classes, from the highest and the lowest, could be counted by hundreds, and by these writings the poor German people were miserably deceived and incensed.'[3]

Here is a specimen of a summons to the people:

Drive the 'Jesuwiders' from the land,
Or else smite down the godless band,
The devil's bodyguard and crew,
Destroy them as God orders you.'[4]

Another 'good poet' wished to see not only the Jesuits, but also 'the bishops all bound together at a stake:'

As all who in the black art deal
In fiery flames to death are done,
So let this mob in fierce fire squeal,
They're devil's children, every one.'[5]

A pamphlet which appeared at Mühlhausen in 1603

[1] See above, p. 117.

[2] *Antiphilippika*, in Goldast; *Politische Reichshändel*, p. 621.

[3] We treat of the polemical writings and their influence more fully in vol. x.

[4] *Jesuiter-Spiegel* (1595), pp. 133–134.

[5] Hasenmüller, *Hist. Jesuitici ordinis*, the German of Leporinus, pp. 626–627.

summoned the German nobility, with most virulent abuse of the Pope, to a bloody war of religion in order to root out the Antichrist and his Antichristian hordes, the ecclesiastical princes of the Empire and the whole body of Catholic clergy. 'The Pope and his rascals,' it says in the dedication of the pamphlet to a gentleman at Rithmanshausen, 'are the only people of wealth; they have possessed themselves of all the money and property by violence, by falsehood, and by lying.' 'O ye pious knights of the German land, behold how ye have all come to be slaves of those womanish, sodomitish villains, how ye have been robbed of your goods and impoverished.' 'Why do you not set yourselves mightily against these devouring wolves, these monstrous thieves or murderers, for that's what the papists are. Open your eyes; it is high time to do so, or you will soon become the bond-servants of the parsons.' 'O Christian nobles, let this my complaint go to your hearts, for nobody else will take the matter in hand.' 'But, alas! you also fear temporal injury. You see that the great masses are against Lutheranism. The bishops and their tonsured crew are bound by their oaths to fight against God and the truth. The towns fear the Emperor Nero. The princes have children and brothers who either hold or obtain feofs from the Antichrist. And Pilate helps Caiaphas against Christ. And the crowd cries out at last that Barabbas is to be released and Jesus put to death. If you go on in this way you will ruin everything, and you will fare as the Jews did at the hands of Titus and Vespasian.' [1]

'Do you not yet see, you German brothers, what is

[1] *Nebelcap dem Papsthum abgezogen* (Mühlhausen, 1603). Dedication, Bl. F. H. pp. 1–4.

in prospect for you ?'—so ran the warning of another pamphlet. 'If you do not begin to stand up for freedom and to get down your clubs and your muskets, you will all be massacred by the priests and the Jesuits and their secular adherents; your wives and children will be strangled like yourselves, or else will be deprived of their goods and chattels, and driven from the German land in poverty and wretchedness. Great and abominable plots and conspiracies are being hatched, believe my words; as true it is as that Christ lives, that the priests and their princes, the Jesuits and their followers, have banded together and sworn to perpetrate a great massacre of this sort in Germany; it is secret still, but true; to the wise it is known; let yourselves be instructed, and do not blind your eyes. Up, up, you dear German brothers, be idle no longer; God's honour and Christ's word and your own salvation are at stake. Up, I say unto you! the priests and the Jesuits and their slavish princes will all fall upon you one fine day with their league; for the love of Christ and His precious blood I implore you, go forward against the villains with your halberds, your cannons, and your muskets.'[1]

Another 'poet,' Johann von Münster, a landed proprietor at Vortlage, who wrote his first lampoons under the name of Philos of Treves, addressed the people as follows in 1605:

Wake up, wake up, thou German land,
With heroes' courage make a stand,
No longer idly slumber:
Accoutred is the tonsured pack,
Us Christians ready to attack;
Demolish their whole number.[2]

[1] In the pamphlet quoted above at p. 416, note, pp. 19, 22–23.

[2] Weller, *Annalen*, i. 362, No. 407; see also i. 374, No. 493, 381; No. 540 and 390; No. 594. *Maximilian Philos* will occupy us again later on.

CHAPTER XXI

TRANSACTIONS CONCERNING A LEAGUE, 1606–1607

THE ecclesiastical Electors waited in vain for an answer to the document they had addressed to the Emperor at the end of October 1603, drawing his attention to the machinations of the Palatine party, and urging on him the necessity of a league between the Catholics and the loyal Protestant Estates for the maintenance of the imperial constitution.[1] On January 3, 1606, Rudolf II. informed the Elector Ernest of Cologne, who had come to Prague, that he did not think it likely that anyone would make an armed attack on the Catholic Estates; if this should happen, however, they were to let him know in good time, and he would then endeavour to prevent the mischief. He added that he did not consider it advisable to form a special league between the Catholic Estates at present, because such a step might easily suggest to others to do likewise. The ministers expressed their fears to the Elector that 'the Emperor was very likely in special communication with the Protestants:' 'if at the next diet any resolution was proposed against the Protestants, his Majesty might be induced to do something in the opposite direction.'[2]

The Elector Ernest had made vain endeavours to

[1] See above, p. 418.

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 779–780, 781, note under 2[b].

enlist the sympathy of the Elector Schweikart of Mayence on behalf of the League. Equally fruitless had been his appeal to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. After his return from Prague he sent a confidential councillor to the Duke to beg for his opinion as to the way in which the Catholic Estates might best secure themselves both against the Turks and Hungary, and against the intrigues of the Protestant Estates; especially in the event of an interregnum, which was so likely a contingency, seeing that the Emperor, in spite of his precarious state of health, still refused to make any settlement with regard to the succession. Maximilian answered that at all events a closer union of the Catholic Estates was very necessary, but that the way of achieving this end needed much consideration. The Emperor had declared himself averse to a league. The Protestant Estates had certainly formed one among themselves for their own self-defence, and presumably, also, for the annihilation of the Catholics; but 'so far they had only been coquetting with affairs,' and there had been little or no outward and visible result. If now the Catholics were to form a league, the matter would not remain secret, 'and the consequence might be that while we, with our usual slowness of procedure, were still negotiating and making preliminary preparations, the Protestants would consider this the opportunity they had so long waited for of fomenting an insurrection in the Empire, and carrying their plans into execution.' As to some of the ecclesiastical Estates, such as the Archbishop of Salzburg and the Bishops of Würzburg and Bamberg joining a league, they could not hope much for this: these prelates, for no other reason than the expense of membership, had withdrawn from the

Landsberg protective alliance, and it would be 'harder than hard' to induce them to join another league.[1]

It was thus that matters stood in the Empire with regard to 'the formidable, bloodthirsty intrigues of the popish princes and popish hangmen.'

The Palatine party meanwhile went on unremittingly with the work of organising a separate Protestant League, to which foreign powers also were to be admitted. It was also part of their calculation to settle the succession in the Empire according to their own ideas. In April 1605 the Count Palatine's councillor gave his opinion on the matter. The Pope, the King of Spain, and the Catholic princes, he said, would certainly have come to an agreement together concerning the future Emperor, and their first thought would probably be an attack on the Palatine Elector, on whom the vicariate of the Empire would devolve. They must therefore make up their minds 'which candidate the Palatinate should support, or otherwise they would be floundering in the wide seas:' they must negotiate on the matter with Saxony and Brandenburg. Löfenius indicated the King of Denmark as a suitable candidate. The Pope and Spain would certainly oppose his election with all their strength, and it might very possibly happen that a Catholic rival Emperor would be elected. If, however, the three secular Electors worked in unison, they would easily overcome all difficulties. 'They would be able to make sure beforehand that Bohemia's vote would be on their side.' It would also be easy to gain one of the ecclesiastical Electors, 'or if the clericals stick together, the war, if so be, would chiefly go against them.' If, however, the King should refuse the honour,

[1] Stieve, ii. 781–782.

they must turn their minds to some less exalted personage: for instance, the brother of the Elector of Saxony; even counts had already been promoted to imperial dignity. Prince Christian of Anhalt recommended the Calvinist prince, Maurice of Orange, as successor. Others among the Count Palatine's councillors, on the contrary, thought it would not be possible to carry through the election of a Protestant Emperor, and spoke in special favour of the Archduke Maximilian. The latter was in fact fixed upon. With the help of the Protestant Estates he was to attain to the royal crown of Bohemia, and before his elevation to the imperial throne he was to pledge himself in an election capitulation to redress the 'grievances' of the Palatine party, and to 'interpret' the Religious Peace according to their ideas. The Elector Palatine further cherished the hope of recovering with Maximilian's help the places ceded before to Nüremberg, and the bailiwick of Hagenau. Christian of Anhalt urged on Frederic IV. to take the lead in the negotiations with the Archduke, and thus to make the successor to the imperial throne 'his beneficiary.' [1]

All the circumstances of the election were to be arranged in concert with the French king, and care was to be taken that France did not let slip again the bishoprics she had wrested from the Empire.

In November 1605 Frederic IV. enjoined the Land-

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 439–443, 457–487; cf. J. Fischer, *Der Linzer Tag vom Jahre 1605 in seiner Bedeutung für die österreichische Haus- und Reichsgeschichte*, based on numerous hitherto unknown archives. Seventh annual report of the *Privatgymnasium Stella Matutina* at Feldkirch (Feldkirch, 1898), p. 19, where it is shown that the hitherto unknown originator of the Diet of Linz was not the Archduke Matthias, but his brother Maximilian, the then governor of the Tyrol and the Marches.

grave Moritz of Hesse to use his influence with Henry IV. for the purpose of frustrating the plans of the Archduke Albert, who was aspiring to the dignity of King of the Romans. Moritz was to represent to the French king that 'if the Archduke accomplished his end, he might revive the old quarrels between Burgundy and France, especially as the oath he would have to take would furnish him with a plausible pretext for reconquering Metz, Toul, and Verdun for the Empire, and then uniting them with Luxemburg. Besides which, Albert would then be more easily able to possess himself of the lands of Jülich. If Albert accomplished these objects, German auxiliary troops would in future be debarred from access to the King of France, and, moreover, a strong frontier line against France would be erected by Austria. The Germans would be compelled by Albert to help in the war both against France and against the Netherlands, and thus the sums spent by Henry on the war against the Dutch would bring him little profit. If now the French king would consent to take up this matter, the Elector was willing, together with the Landgrave and a few others, 'to enter into confidential and secret negotiations with him.' [1]

At the end of December Henry informed the princes that he was ready to oppose the Archduke's candidature for the throne; he also appealed to the King of England through an ambassador to do likewise.[2]

It did not enter into Henry IV.'s calculation that there should be an election of a king during Rudolf II's. lifetime; on the contrary, when, in the summer of

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 460–461, and 468–469, *Das Anbringen an Heinrich IV.* of January 27, 1606.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 461, note 1.

1606, Prince Christian of Anhalt, as ambassador from the Count Palatine, had endeavoured to gain his support for the Archduke Maximilian, he had said that 'it would be better to wait till the death of the Emperor before naming a successor;' the continuance of anarchy in Germany and the powerless condition of the House of Austria fitted in exactly with his political plans.

Prince Christian had had personal negotiations with the Archduke, and was of opinion that the latter was willing to fall in with the Count Palatine's intentions. King Henry, however, knew that this was not the case. On April 25, 1606 a secret treaty was concluded at Vienna by the Archdukes Matthias, Maximilian, Ferdinand and Maximilian Ernest to the effect that, 'Under the lamentable condition of Hungary and of the Austrian dominions the Emperor, in consequence of his mental illness, is little fitted to carry on the government. The dangers arising from the existing state of things must be prevented, and accordingly, Matthias, the firstborn, must be unanimously recognised as the head and the prop of the House of Austria. The other Archdukes engage themselves beforehand to agree to whatever he should arrange in this difficult business, with the Pope, the King of Spain, the Archduke Albert and other princes. Should there be question of an imperial election, they would work with united forces to raise Matthias to the throne.'[1] Henry IV. had received information of this treaty.[2] In a letter to

[1] Hammer, i.; *Urkundensamml.* pp. 427–248 Archduke Albert agreed to the compact on November 11, 1606. Hammer, ii.; *Urkundensamml.* pp. 27–28. Concerning the deciding influence of Klese in the Vienna treaty, see Kerschbaumer, p. 101; Stieve, ii. 847, note 3; Klopp, i. 39; Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 51.

[2] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 166, note 1. See also Wenzelburger, ii. 778.

the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, in which he recounted his negotiations with Prince Christian, he made no single allusion to Maximilian's candidature for the throne, but only mentioned that he had caused it to be represented to the princes that they should be ready duly to co-operate in the election of a Roman king—if an opportunity should offer—and it was necessary to come to an agreement.[1]

What the French King had before all things at heart, then as before, was the formation of a Protestant union. This, he now declared to Prince Christian, as before he had done to the Landgrave Moritz, was imperatively necessary for the Protestant Estates; he on his part was ready to join them in a league of this sort, and to pay down to the funds for accomplishment of their common aims two thirds of the sum which the remaining members would contribute between them.[2]

As soon as Christian had returned from France, the Palatiners embarked on the work of canvassing for the League in Germany, and the first members they secured were the Elector of Brandenburg, the Duke of Würtemberg, the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, and the Margraves of Ansbach and Culmbach. A charter of the League was drafted according to plans drawn up by Henry IV.; Christian was sent as ambassador to the courts of the different princes to represent to them how urgently this league was needed, and how favourable the present opportunity was for its formation, 'because France offered her support so willingly, which would not always be the case.' In return for the support

[1] Rommel, *Correspondance*, p. 322.
[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 505 ff., 538.

of France the confederates were to promise Henry IV. that, in case of need and at summons, they would be ready to succour himself, his heirs, and his kingdom with efficient cavalry and infantry levied in Germany.

But the Franco-Palatine plan for a union met everywhere with mistrust. At the beginning of 1607 Christian wrote that nothing had yet been accomplished and that the matter would 'not turn out well' unless Henry IV. came forward resolutely himself, 'interposed his own authority, and set to work betimes to lay the necessary foundations, and to excite enthusiasm in the cause.' [1]

At Christian's suggestion Frederic IV. sent an ambassador to Paris in February to beg the King to hasten on the decisions of the German princes, and to hold out hope of still larger contributions to the funds of the League than he had already promised. Henry actually replied that he would not limit himself to two thirds, but would pay down exactly the same amount as all the other members together.[2] On March 29 the King admonished the Elector of Brandenburg to further the formation of this union through which alone 'German freedom' could be maintained.[3] He also addressed the most urgent injunctions [4] to Moritz of Hesse, who was in his pay.[5] To the Duke of Würtem-

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 518–521, 525–533, 537–538; *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 250, note 2; Gindely, *Rudolf II.* Bd. i. 135, note 3.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 557, 562, 576.

[3] Ritter, i. 557, note 1 to No. 460. [4] Ritter, i. 542.

[5] '. . . Je vous exorte et prie de toute mon affection de continuer à mettre les deux mains à l'œuvre, affin qu'il soit poursuivi sans delay et interruption jusques à la perfection, et qu'il n'en advienne comme autrefois que j'ay fait semblables propositions lesquelles sont demeurées imparfaictes, sans produire d'autres effects que honteux et dommageables à ceux qui s'en sont entremis' (Rommel, *Correspondance*, p. 344).

berg he forwarded welcome sums of money in return for supplies formerly granted to him,[1] and the latter entered into negotiations respecting the League with the Count Palatine. In December 1607 Frederic IV. told an ambassador of the Duke that 'Kurbrandenburg, Ansbach, Culmbach, Hesse-Cassel and the House of Anhalt would be easily persuaded to form the League, but the important matter was to gain over the towns, without which the princes would not be able to achieve much. The Duke, he said, had better, therefore, try first to win Ulm, Strasburg, and Nuremburg.'

They hoped to draw the towns into the Union as it were with bandaged eyes. The Elector advised that at first 'nothing should be said to them about the King of France, concerning whom they might have misgivings.' And, after all, 'Henry IV. was only a sort of accessory who had no share in originating the Union, but would only help to strengthen it, and who might be useful later on as occasion arose.' If once the three towns above-mentioned joined, Frankfort, Spires, Worms and others would soon follow suit, for all that the towns lacked at present 'was a leader.' Events that occurred in the town of Donauwörth furnished 'such an excellent opportunity' for obtaining from the towns anything that might be demanded that 'it must not be allowed to slip out of their hands.' [2]

The events at Donauwörth had the most important bearing on the conclusion of the Protestant League, and on deepening the schism in the Empire.

[1] Baudrillart, p. 446. [2] Ritter, i. 609.

CHAPTER XXII

EVENTS AT DONAUWÖRTH UP TO THE YEAR 1608 [1]

DONAUWÖRTH, a small imperial city of some 4,000 inhabitants, was among the number of those towns in which both Catholics and Protestants retained possession of their privileges in conformity with the Religious Pacification of Augsburg, and were bound to leave each other undisturbed in the exercise of their respective creeds and Church usages, rites, and ceremonies.[2] But so little did the Protestant pastor and the preacher at the Church of St. John's understand the meaning of tolerance, that the Town Council in 1560 had been obliged to issue stringent orders to them that they were not 'to inveigh so fiercely from the pulpit against the Religious Pacification, nor to forbid the burghers attending the church attached to the convent of the Holy Cross,' the one church allowed to the Catholics for their worship.[3] Seven years later the municipal authorities themselves took the first step towards the gradual suppression of the open, unrestricted performance of Catholic worship which had prevailed till then, and towards the wholesale uprooting of the Catholic religion in the town. In 1567 the town council, strong in a

[1] Apart from the importance which they gained in relation to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, the events at Donauwörth deserve exhaustive treatment, because in this individual case the conditions of the free towns generally are amply mirrored.

[2] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 32. [3] Königsdorfer, ii. 179.

Protestant majority, curtailed the rites and ceremonies customary at Catholic funerals, and in the following year forbade the Holy Sacrament to be carried openly to the dying. The Bishop of Augsburg, who, as spiritual head of the Donauwörth Catholics, complained to the town council, was told by one of the burgomasters that 'they could not any longer allow such acts of idolatry.' In the year 1573 processions with flying banners and audible prayer were forbidden, and on the Bishop's entering a fresh protest, the prohibition was justified on the ground that 'there were many journeymen and visitors from Saxony and other places in the town, who had never in their life seen a person belonging to a religious order, or witnessed such ceremonies, and if any of these should chance to be the worse for drink, mischief or unpleasant adventures might easily arise.' Such were the reasons for which the Catholics were to forego their right to open exercise of their religion!

The persecution grew worse and worse. In 1577 the council enacted that no burgher, except on pain of loss of citizenship and expulsion from the town, might have his children baptised, or receive the Sacrament, or go through the ceremony of marriage, anywhere but in the Lutheran parish church. The Bishop of Augsburg, who again protested, with appeal to the Religious Pacification and with a threat of complaint to the Emperor, was put off with an evasive answer. In 1578, however, the council modified its enactment and contented itself with the decree that 'nobody must be married or have a child baptised in any but the parish church, unless permission had been obtained from the burgomaster, and the proper fees paid to the Lutheran pastor.' The pastor Weiland, who was instituted in

the following year, and his assistant Neuberger, were not satisfied with this amount of persecution against the Catholics; they anathematised 'popish idolatry' from the pulpit, and accused the council of 'playing into the hands of those who practised it.' Thus Donauwörth also could echo the complaint which the Catholic Estates raised at the Ratisbon Diet of 1594: In violation of the Religious Pacification and in the face of all reason and natural right the Catholics are decried by preachers as idolaters and pagans. According to the Religious Peace, 'the Catholics should be allowed to visit the stations of the Cross and conduct their processions and pilgrimages on ground and soil held by adherents of the Augsburg Confession. For some time past, however, this has not been allowed. At Donauwörth it is actually forbidden, in the name of the municipal authorities, to take the Sacrament to infirm and sick Catholics; the children of Catholic parents are christened in the churches of the Confessionists, and the dead might not be carried to their graves according to Catholic usage with lighted torches.'

These complaints from the Catholic Estates only incited the Council of Donauwörth to embark on the complete extermination of the Catholic faith. The Margrave of Ansbach's chancellor, Doctor Hieronymus Fröschel, who had been repeatedly asked for a memorandum of advice, had before this said that the Catholics were 'the devil's vermin; it was impossible to come to agreement with them.' In 1596 the town council ordained that no more Catholics were to be received as citizens; the attainment to civic posts and privileges was made dependent on conversion to Lutheranism; the right of citizenship was withheld from

the sons of Catholic burghers. The result of all these measures was that the number of Catholics, which at the time of the Treaty of Passau had equalled the Protestant population, became reduced, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, to about sixteen families, most of them poor ones.[1]

The abbots of the monastery of the Holy Cross, with the exception of a few protests, had submitted to the pretensions of the council, and had endeavoured to keep up friendly relations with it, in spite of all the odious enactments against the Catholics. But in 1602, on the appointment of a new abbot, a serious quarrel broke out between the monastery and the council. The latter, driven back by order of the Imperial Aulic Council, within the limits of the law, proceeded acrimoniously to further persecution. A Catholic burgher's wife, who lay dying in the hospital and wished for the last Sacrament, was refused her request. The same thing happened to a maid-servant who had been mortally wounded. Matters came to an open breach between the monastery and the council in 1605, on the occasion of a procession of prayer, which the abbot wished to conduct through a portion of the town with a banner flying. The council caused the procession to be stopped and the banner to be taken away, whereupon the Bishop of Augsburg procured from the Imperial Aulic tribunal a writ against the council for 'criminal, wanton violence committed in violation of the Religious and the Public Peace; the council was ordered, on pain of the imperial ban, to abstain henceforth from oppressing or offending the monastery and the Catholics in connection with the

[1] Königsdorfer, ii. 204–209; Wolf, *Maximilian*, i. 159; Lossen, *Donauwörth*, p. 4; Stieve, *Ursprung*, pp. 17–24.

free exercise of their religion, and was told that if it thought it had any claim or grievance against the above, it must avail itself of the regular and proper methods of law, and must rest content with the decisions of the latter.' [1]

Against this order, issued 'without clause,' the council handed in an appeal to the Aulic Council, and charged the abbot, in the following April, when a similar procession was to take place, to avoid, above all, anything that could cause offence to the evangelical burghers. The abbot answered that he hoped the town council did not intend to act in opposition to the imperial orders, and let the procession begin.

It then became manifest to what a depth of barbarity the people of the town had descended. Ever since the second half of the sixteenth century the protocols of the council had been more and more frequently concerned with profligate carousals, houses of ill-fame and gambling, immorality and adultery, nocturnal riots, armed adventures, drunken brawls and murders: but even the most abominable crimes had gone unpunished.[2]

The populace, which had been stirred up against the monks and papists by the preachers, armed itself with fire-arms, spears, poles, and clubs, and made a most brutal onslaught on the procession. The banner was destroyed and the processionists pelted with stones and scattered asunder amid savage yelling.[3]

The council, far from punishing the offence, did not

[1] Senkenberg, xxii. 442; Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 36; Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 191–192.

[2] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 41.

[3] The attack took place on the return of the procession into the town; see the *Instrument* of the notary Joh. Schrall, who was an eye-witness, in Steichele, *Das Bistum Augsburg, historisch und statistisch beschrieben*, iii. 737.

even attempt to justify itself before the abbot. It appealed for help to the Protestant Estates assembled at a Diet at Worms, and the latter in a petition against the Aulic Council which they sent in to the Emperor introduced the verdict against Donauwörth as one of their causes of complaint.

The Aulic Council sent a second mandate to the council, but the council again raised a protest and threw the blame of the tumult on the mob, over which it said it had no control. In consequence of this the Emperor, on March 16, 1607, addressed himself to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. 'Whereas it appeared,' Rudolf wrote to the Duke, 'as if the town authorities of Donauwörth had not power to oppose adequate resistance to their unruly burghers, and whereas safety and propriety required that this criminal, seditious commencement should be checked, and pious, innocent persons be protected from further injury, he begged the Duke, as a neighbouring overlord and an illustrious prince of the Empire, to undertake in the name of the Emperor, either personally or through delegates, to make effectual arrangements whereby, on the occasion of the next public procession, the Catholics should be protected, and all wanton and seditious interference be checked and suppressed.'[1] The Donauwörth Council received instructions not to oppose this order, and to guard against all insubordination on the part of the burghers, so that it might not be necessary to proceed to still severer measures.[2]

Without any interested *arrière pensée* Maximilian

[1] Wolf, ii. 198–199; Häberlin, xxii. 444. The opinion that the Duke solicited this commission is erroneous; see Lossen, viii. 10; Stieve, *Ursprung, Anmerkungen*, S. 24, zu S. 52, 2.

[2] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 52.

undertook the Emperor's order and sent two commissioners to Donauwörth with instructions to bring the council to obedience to the imperial mandate, and to demand from it a 'Revers' to the effect that 'in accordance with the Religious Pacification the Catholics should no longer be in any way hindered in their religious rites;' the commissioners were to attend the procession of St. Mark's day in person.

Two days before the arrival of the commissioners the council had publicly posted up a notice prohibiting the contemplated procession, and describing the rising of the preceding year as a tumult of the common people, but reserving to themselves, in all matters connected with the prayer procession, the rights 'which belonged to a magistracy on such occasions.'[1] When the commissioners presented their instructions to the council on April 23 they were told that 'the business was important, but that nothing could be done without the consent of the burghers; all the different guilds should be summoned together, but they must wait till the next day, as it was then already too late; most of the burghers were in a state of intoxication, besides which they were obdurate and turbulent.' On the following day, however, a tremendous uproar arose. 'We were just proceeding to the convent of the Holy Cross to attend divine service there,' the commissioners reported to the Duke, 'when an alarm was raised that a crowd of burghers armed with spears, muskets, clubs, and weapons of all kinds were bearing down upon the council-house, and threatening to slay with their own hands any man who did not seize the best arms he could, and strike dead the commissioners and the servants

[1] Lossen, p. 11; Häberlin, xxii. 444.

of the priests.' Two hundred men attacked the monastery in order 'to ransack it and to massacre the abbot and all the monks, and us into the bargain, as indeed they announced repeatedly and unmistakably as they hurried along. Finding ourselves thus in the greatest danger, we had the monastery barricaded, and as far as possible bolted and barred.'

Although the council was in reality 'hand in glove with the burghers,' it made a pretence of trying to quell the uproar, at the same time, however, explaining to the commissioners that it could not 'guarantee them any security against injury,' as it had no control over the community.

The commissioners yielded to force and left the town with the intimation that they would give the council six weeks to consider whether or no it would obey the Emperor.

'Moreover,' the report of the commissioners goes on, 'we must not conceal from your Highness that in this town of Donauwörth it is chiefly persons without means, loafers, desperadoes, and insolent ruffians, who have brought about all these complications, and stirred up the rest of the town to rebellion. It appears also especially that it was a goldsmith of the name of Schenk who was the originator of the tumult, for he was the first to cry out that the citizens were to seize arms and massacre all the Catholics together with the commissioners.' 'This man,' the commissioners wrote, 'had said to their servants that the burghers did not care a fig for the Emperor and the Bavarian prince. Only let these come themselves, and they would soon make an end of his Majesty and of your Highness: if they did not throw them into the Danube they would

at any rate hang them out over the city walls and stick their tongues through with skewers.' 'One of the burgomasters, a butcher by trade, did indeed exhort and admonish the burghers to let things be, and to allow the Catholics to hold their procession. But the burghers answered him that he and the council had begun this work, and now that it was getting into swing they wanted to back out of it. They, the burghers, however, meant to go on to the bitter end, whether the burgomasters and council liked it or not, for they could not recede from what they had begun without incurring the ridicule of the other imperial towns.' [1]

From this moment the Donauwörth uproar acquired universal significance, and, in consequence of the interference of the Protestant Estates, threatened to engross the whole Empire.

The Count Palatine Louis of Neuburg and the town of Ulm, appealed to for help by the Donauwörth Council, summoned a number of the Lutheran Estates to a Diet at Nördlingen, when the ambassadors of Neuburg, Ansbach, Würtemberg, and of several imperial cities agreed to the following resolution (May 1607): 'The Council of Donauwörth is in its right against the Abbot and the Bishop of Augsburg. Although the town had expressly recognised the Imperial Aulic Council, the procedure of the latter, because not issuing from a legitimate tribunal, is declared null and void; also, the Emperor's order to Duke Maximilian was unlawful, for by the imperial constitution the execution of the

[1] Wolf, ii. 199-204. The minor council, whose members belonged chiefly to the more distinguished families, had given in to the demands of the commissioners, but not so the major council, composed of the different guilds. See Lossen, *Donauwörth*, p. 10; Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 196-197.

decrees of the Imperial Chamber is vested in the governor of the circle, and the Duke of Bavaria does not belong to the circle in question. The members present at this assembly addressed a written statement to the Emperor, the Duke, and the Bishop of Augsburg, warning them not to go on with the work they had begun, and expressing the hope that any further proceedings would be delayed until the next imperial Diet, when they trusted that means would be found to prevent any enforcement of the imperial orders.'[1] Relying on their allies, the members of the Council of Donauwörth entered fresh protests at the imperial court against the measures which the Duke had proposed, and they let the appointed six weeks go by without tendering their obedience. Meanwhile the monks and the Catholics in the town had to endure all manner of ridicule and persecution.[2]

The Duke of Bavaria, however, was not willing to sit down quietly under the 'by no means trifling insult' which had been offered him. On April 20 he sent the report of his commissioners to the Emperor by his own private messenger, writing himself to Rudolf as follows: 'Your Majesty will see that the rebels of Donauwörth have not only acted in a most penal manner against the religious and the profane peace established in the Holy Empire, but that they have also been guilty of defiance, insolence, and contempt towards your Majesty such as have never yet been met with in an Estate of the Empire, that they have thrown to the wind the instructions graciously imparted by your Majesty, and that they have not only held themselves in readiness to lay violent hands on any sub-delegates,

[1] Lossen, pp. 12–14; Stieve, pp. 85–92.
[2] Lossen, pp. 14–15; Stieve, p. 109.

but have also used highly punishable language against your Majesty's imperial person, and against myself.' If the Emperor, he said, allowed 'defiance so monstrous' to go unpunished, it was easily conceivable that other imperial cities 'in which our true and alone saving religion was still paramount, and which would by no means be unmindful of this imperial commission, and of the manner in which it had been rejected, might also be encouraged to go on coercing and restricting the Catholics in matters of religion, until by degrees the true faith was completely rooted out.' It was therefore necessary 'to carry into effect the severe measures threatened against Donauwörth:' he himself was ready to enforce all that the Emperor commanded. If, however, 'the offence which the people of Donauwörth have committed against your Majesty, and against me as your Majesty's agent, is passed over unpunished, the result will be that in future this or that Estate will be equally rebellious against any imperial solicitations, and indeed they will not be wholly without justification.'[1]

But no prompt decision was to be expected from the Court at Prague. The invalid Emperor now, as before, troubled himself very little about business of State; the councillors were disunited, and some of them open to bribery. It was not until June 13 that an answer reached the Duke at Munich, and it was then easy to see that 'there was no intention on the Emperor's part of proceeding to execution.' In consequence of this the Duke begged the Emperor, 'if he did not intend to carry out the sentence of the ban, to be graciously pleased to release him from any further

[1] Wolf, ii. 205-207.

connection with the Donauwörth affair.'[1] This decisive tone on the part of Maximilian and the discontent occasioned by the action of the Protestant Estates at Nordlingen, and their rebellion against the Imperial Aulic Council brought things to a climax, and on August 3 the proclamation of the sentence was formulated.

The imperial herald was just setting out to take the document to the Duke when a submissive despatch arrived from the Donauwörth Council. The tumult, they said, was a disgraceful proceeding occasioned by the mob; they, the members of the council, were quite innocent in the matter, and had themselves been in danger of life from the populace. Two of the agitators had already been put in prison. They begged the Emperor not to proceed against the town, but only against the ringleaders of the riots. After this the Emperor determined to waive the act of the ban, and he informed the Duke that he should be satisfied if the council gave a written guarantee that the Catholics should be allowed free exercise of their religion, and inflicted suitable punishment on the offenders.[2]

In accordance with the imperial wish Maximilian again sent commissioners to Donauwörth, and on September 9, after six days' negotiations, they obtained consent to their demands from the minor council. The Duke now considered his commission executed, and he sent the written guarantee of the council to the Emperor.

But the very next day the compact was annulled. The major council of the 'Twenty' and the community refused to ratify the written document; a committee

[1] Wolf, ii. 213–215. [2] Wolf, ii. 218–221.

of members of the guilds took possession of the town keys; the artisans forsook the workshops and spent their days and nights in the drinking-taverns; the populace, stirred up by a preacher, threatened to exterminate the whole monkish rabble. The minor council had handed over two prisoners to the Duke for punishment, and they now begged him to waive the trial and the punishment of the remaining culprits. Maximilian promised to support their appeal with the Emperor on condition that free exercise of their religion was granted to the Catholics, and that the enactment against electing Catholics on the council was abolished. These demands were very moderate and entirely in accordance with the Religious Pacification. The ducal commissioners, who were to bring them before the major and the minor councils, and also before the committee of the guilds, were further instructed that, 'with regard to the public exercise of religion,' they must 'proceed discreetly and not with inopportune zeal,' so as not to excite the populace.[1]

When the commissioners arrived they found 'everybody idle, and the whole party muddled and fuddled.' At nine o'clock in the morning they reported to the Duke that the council were prepared and willing to answer our proposals. But at five o'clock in the evening nothing had been settled. 'The burgomaster Wurm was already somewhat the worse for drink; the town syndicus was completely intoxicated; both of them said that, as all the burghers were tipsy, we must wait till the next day for their answer. A wine tapster, two town servants, and a few small boys, who were all as drunk as they could be, were

[1] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 123.

then told off to serve us with food. They placed before us some fish, crabs, and a few tankards of wine.' 'As it is customary for the burgomaster and some of the councillors to take part in these offices, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that an insult was intended to your Highness and your sub-delegates. The whole night through they kept watch over us, and showed their exultation at having got us into their power. They indulged in all sorts of insolence, swaggering in and out incessantly with lighted matches, loading their muskets, and clanking forks and spears. In front of our rooms they sang the hymn, "Now praise the Lord, O my soul." From the city tower the watchman trumpeted out the tune of "Lord, uphold us by Thy Word." '

As no answer was given, the commissioners left the town. The Duke sent the Emperor a report of the proceedings on October 9, expressing his opinion that the time had now come for action because 'the stiff-necked people, in spite of all the indulgence that had been shown them, persisted in their culpable, disgraceful insubordination.' Either the town must ratify the afore-written letter of guarantee respecting Catholic worship, and must agree to admit Catholics to the council, or else the ban must be pronounced without further delay.[1] The Emperor declared himself in agreement with the Duke, but still went on hoping that the end might be achieved by lenient measures. The Duke accordingly, for the third time, sent commissioners, and after five days' negotiations with the plenipotentiaries of the two councils and of the guilds the imperial conditions were actually accepted. Early

[1] Wolf, ii. 222–231.

in the morning of November 10, one guild after another signified its consent. The year long quarrel seemed at last made up.

On the same day, however, there appeared on the scene the legal agent of the Neuburg Palatinate, Doctor Roth, who presented to the town council a written document from some of the Protestant Estates assembled in conclave at Ulm, admonishing the community to go on holding out. The town, they said, had only to let the Emperor's proclamation of the ban have full play, and the Estates would know how to help them out of the dilemma. The question now at issue was not merely one of civic freedom, but also of religion and of the spiritual salvation of the citizens. The community, emboldened by this missive, and restored to their defiant attitude, retracted all their previous resolutions and gave the commissioners an answer which the Duke could only regard as a repudiation of his demands. The result was that on November 12 a herald of the Empire, who had accompanied the commissioners, proclaimed the ban over the town.

In order to be ready for all emergencies, Maximilian had continued his military preparations all through the negotiations, and on December 8 he despatched to Donauwörth an army of 6,000 infantry and 600 cavalry, besides 12 pieces of artillery. So strong a detachment of troops was not necessary for overmastering this little town, but the Duke was afraid that the Neuburg Palatinate, Würtemberg, and Ulm would come to its assistance. None of them came, however. The Estates had only indulged in fine-sounding words. The town, left helpless, was reduced to surrender. On December 17 it was besieged by

300 cavalry and 600 infantry. The Bavarian general Haslang had exacted beforehand the promise that none of the inhabitants should be injured in respect of their goods and chattels, and he was most strict in keeping the troops to their word. With regard to religion also the same mercy was shown.

The Duke had consulted his councillors at Munich as to whether he was entitled to go on propagating the Catholic religion in the banned town and in suppressing the heretical sects that had intruded themselves. Their answer had been in the negative. Not only, they said, did the Imperial Commission confer no power to expel the preachers and to promote the Lutheran form of religion, but such procedure was opposed to the Religious Pacification, which stipulated that, in towns where both religions were professed, no one party must coerce the other with regard to its faith. Maximilian must not expose himself to the reproach that he too, like the Donauwörthers before, had been guilty of violating this treaty. The Religious Peace was indeed the only remaining link which held the Estates and the Empire together, and they must be careful if they did not wish to turn the world topsy-turvy and to involve the Catholics in ruin. 'Moreover,' the councillors went on, 'people are growing sick of the senseless outcry and complaints that the Catholics think of nothing else but how best to suppress and exterminate the Protestants, and that they regard them as heretics with whom it is not necessary to keep faith; the very opposite of this is taught and practised by the Catholics. Besides, the theologians themselves say also expressly that, in matters of religion and liberty, the plighted word must be kept with heretics also, and

their freedom of religion tolerated if it cannot be prevented without causing worse detriment: in which case it is also morally lawful to form a compact.'[1]

The Duke must proceed gradually and mildly; he must not suppress the Protestant religion, but he must only recognise such preachers as did not make a practice of incensing the common people against the Catholic faith and the Catholics in their sermons. On the other side care must be taken to provide zealous, pious clergymen, of blameless moral character, who would keep up intercourse with the people and would understand how to instruct them in the Catholic religion; the continued presence of the Jesuits would be very useful to this end; an appeal should be made to the Emperor concerning the assignment of a church to the Catholics. And if then, later on, an energetic administrator was set over the town, more and more of the burghers would certainly be converted, especially as the multitude generally followed the guidance of the ruling authorities in matters of religion, and there were already numbers who would have become Catholic if they had only dared. It was no less certain that as the state of things grew more secure, Catholics would gradually come into the town from outside.[2]

With his own hand the Duke wrote out the order for his commissioners that, with regard to religious

[1] 'Hæreticis in negotio libertatis religionis fidem esse servandam, et tolerandam libertatem religionis, cum sine majori detrimento imperiri [impediri] non possit; in quo casu etiam licite et honesto pacisci possit.' In this sense the Mayence Jesuit Becan, among other theologians, had expressed himself in a pamphlet of his own, to which we shall refer later on, when dealing with the polemics concerning the Religious Peace.

[2] Stieve, *Ursprung*, pp. 265–268; the *Gutachten*, in Wolf, ii. 260–267. According to Stieve, *Anmerkungen*, pp. 94–368, note 1, the *Gutachten* is a perverted and mutilated account.

matters, no changes were to be made in the existing state of things. As the preachers—the prime instigators of rebellion among the people—had taken flight, the parish church was taken possession of as 'a waste domain without a lord;' the Jesuits were to preach in it, but not to undertake other official functions; the Lutheran cantor was also allowed to hold divine service in this church, with singing of Psalms or Lutheran hymns. The Protestants were free to attend services and to receive the Sacraments at Berg or Zirgesheim; their funerals might be solemnised in the usual manner, with singing and with general prayer by the side of the grave. If any burgher announced himself as wishing to go over to Catholicism, the commissioner informed him that this was not compulsory and that there must be no humbugging; the Duke did not wish to tyrannise over anybody's conscience. In order to deprive the Protestant Estates of all ground for complaint the commissioners caused a certificate to be drawn up by the Protestant burghers and attested by a notary, declaring that there was no coercion in religious matters.[1]

In December the army of execution was disbanded; only a garrison of 300 men remained in the town.

In a despatch to the Pope, Maximilian expressed the hope that, 'by the prompt enforcement of the ban against Donauwörth, the Emperor's prestige in the Empire had been in no slight measure confirmed,' and that 'great help and impetus' had been given to the Catholic religion, and that this would be 'comforting and reassuring' to many other places also.[2]

[1] Wolf, ii. 268; Stieve, pp. 268–270; Lossen, pp. 56–57.
[2] Wolf, ii. 254–255.

But the opposite happened. The enforcement of the ban, far from strengthening the imperial prestige in the realm and the cause of the Catholic religion, helped materially to further the plans of the Palatine revolutionary party.

'It is just as if a fierce conflagration had broken out among all the Protestants,' wrote the Mayence physician Edmund Schrader from Ratisbon on January 11, 1608, 'for Donauwörth is full of more extraordinarily false reports about the execution of the ban than have ever been heard in the Empire within the memory of man.' On his journey to Ratisbon he had actually 'heard sensible men say that all the burghers in Donauwörth had been compelled to abjure their faith publicly in the market place, and that those who refused to do so were thrown into the tower, put in the stocks, or decapitated. Children had been torn from their parents and baptised afresh as papists; one woman who had resisted had been stabbed. The Jesuits were unremitting in preaching that it would be better for the town to be reduced to a heap of ashes than for a single heretic to be left in it; that now that the heretics had become timorous and faint-hearted it was the very time to root them out with fire and sword, and to proclaim the Pope and the King of Spain as sole sovereigns.' 'Now, as the Jesuits and their party were so energetic in their proceedings,' said these same sensible men, 'it was imperatively necessary that the evangelicals should combine together everywhere in order to check the devilish rabble, for it was not only hereditary German liberty which was at stake, but faith and salvation, and the people of Germany must not give themselves up to the service of the devil.

First and foremost the imperial cities must be on their guard, because what had happened at Donauwörth was likely to befall other towns as well.'[1] The Protestant party would rather have seen Donauwörth in the power of the Turks than under the 'anti-Christian Roman yoke.' Hans Sepp of Ulm recounted the pretended attacks of the papists against the imperial towns in a long poem which ended with the words:

> Could I but live to see the sight
> Of nuns and Jesuits drowned outright!
> And if they'd hang the priests and Pope
> I'd give my all to buy the rope.[2]

The exciting question of 'Confessions' assumed a 'remarkable character' at the Diet at Ratisbon.

[1] To the Bartholomäusstift at Frankfort-on-the-Main.
[2] Stieve, *Ursprung*, pp. 228–229.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE DIET AT RATISBON, 1608—DISSOLUTION OF THE DIET

THE Emperor Rudolf clung tenaciously to the idea of a war with the Turks and hoped for 'generous help' from the Estates, whom he had summoned to a Diet at Ratisbon. On January 12, 1608, the meeting was opened.[1] 'God help the Empire!' wrote Edmund Schrader from Ratisbon a few weeks later; 'everything is getting out of joint and the whole talk is of threatened murder and bloodshed. The more preposterous the news is that comes pouring in every day, the more readily does it find credence with the people.' It is already a 'certain fact' that the Pope has got 10,000 men under arms and that he is going to send them into the Empire under the command of Jesuits in disguise; that the King of Spain has deposited 100,000 ducats in some secret place; that bills of conscription are already being distributed; and that the Duke of Bavaria has already equipped 15,000 men; in short, 'a horrible deluge of blood is about to burst upon the poor evangelical Christians and all who believe the truth.' In comparision with 'such veracious and frightful' reports as these it was a mere trifle that rumour should tell that the ambassadors of the evangelical princes had

[1] Concerning the preliminary transactions and the extent of the Emperor's demands, see von Egloffstein, pp. 16–24.

been refused their demand at Ratisbon for free exercise of religion, and that some of them had left the Diet; that the imperial commissioner, Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, had the keys of the town in his possession and would not give them up.[1]

That the Archduke, who had shown such zeal and energy in furthering the work of Catholic restoration in his own land, should have been nominated by the Emperor as his representative at the Diet, was regarded by the Protestants as 'a most outrageous insult.' 'They chose to take it,' so Edmund Schrader reported on February 3, 'as a manifest token of what the Jesuits had in view, without stopping to consider that the Archduke in his territory was doing no more than they themselves had done in their own lands against the Catholics, and that he had no less right on his side than they had on theirs.' 'To hear the way in which the ambassadors of the Palatinate, of Brandenburg, of Saxony and others discourse, it would seem as if in a few months we should be in the thick of war.' 'And they are all of them, as they do not scruple to proclaim openly, busy stirring up their lords against us Catholics; and the Archduke's councillors also, over their drinking and gambling, let fall much bragging, indecent talk, which is all spread abroad in an exaggerated form and begets mistrust and acrimony.'[2]

According to the reports of the ambassadors of the Elector of Brandenburg the Jesuits proclaimed in their sermons that the time had come to root out the heretics;

[1] To the Bartholomäusstift at Frankfort-on-the-Main, February 3, 1608. The Frankfort syndicus, Caspar Schacher, also wrote to the council from Ratisbon on January 29, concerning the utter groundlessness of all these reports (*Frankfurter Reichstagsakten*, p. 94, fol. 26[b]).

[2] See *ibid.*

money and weapons were at hand, and all good Catholics must give themselves freely to the work; the imperial councillor, Andreas Hannewaldt, who had accompanied the Archduke, had talked in similar fashion at a banquet; Ferdinand's courtiers also indulged in threatening language, 'so that it seemed in very truth as if everything was going higgledy-piggledy.' Bavaria intended to retain hold of Donauwörth, at any rate until the costs of enforcing the ban had been defrayed—possibly for good and all. The Protestant religion would be suppressed. In Hungary the conditions of the Religious Peace had been violated. There was therefore 'no longer any doubt that the adherents of the Catholic religion, influenced by those hellish vipers the Jesuits in a direction towards which they were themselves only too much inclined, were plotting nothing good, but, on the contrary, were bent on dealing with all the evangelical Estates as they had done with Donauwörth. Therefore 'it was imperatively necessary to consider the question of a new Smalcald League.' 'God be praised,' the ambassadors added, 'there is no longer a Charles of Ghent to disintegrate and shelter it.' The Archduke Ferdinand 'had been closeted with Bavaria, and also, so it was said, with the Elector of Cologne in the Carthusian monastery.' It was certain 'that very grave business' had been transacted on this occasion, for it was well known 'what sort of feelings these princes entertained towards the poor bands of Christians.' [1]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 630, note 1, 658. Despatch of the ambassador Pruckmann, in Ranke, *Zur deutschen Geschichte*, p. 278, where there are also further remarks of Hannewaldt uttered by him 'after, according to his habit, he had muddled himself with drink.' Pruckmann, indeed, reported to the Elector that the Archduke Ferdinand him-

'It is indeed extraordinary,' wrote Edmund Schrader, 'what an amount of information of all sorts the Protestants are able to communicate concerning leagues and intrigues which the Catholic princes, both temporal and spiritual, are organising both among themselves and with foreign potentates, with a view to the extermination of the evangelicals. The Catholics, however, know nothing whatever about such conspiracies, for, as a matter of fact, they do not exist.' [1]

The Protestants regarded in the light of 'tangible concrete' evidence of murderous popish designs' a letter of Bishop Wolfgang from Ratisbon which had been written before the Diet and which was generally known. In this letter, dated October 22, 1607, Wolfgang had summoned his ecclesiastical colleagues to combine together. The Protestant Estates, it was said in the letter, would undoubtedly, at the forthcoming Diet, vote unanimously respecting the Donauwörth affair, and would make it an occasion for stirring up other troubles and complications, and would go to the utmost bounds in their attempts against the Catholic religion. They would endeavour again to obtain the 'religious emancipation' which had already been demanded at former diets. To yield on this point, however, would be nothing less than open sacrifice and annihilation of the Catholic religion. The Protestants, after wresting from the Church so many important bishoprics as well as innumerable abbeys and convents, would now at once want to share those that

self had called the evangelical Estates 'devils and beasts' (p. 277). Such assertions certainly do not coincide with 'the kind and friendly manner' of Ferdinand in dealing with the Protestant ambassadors. See v. Egloffstein, p. 47.

[1] In the letter quoted above at p. 468, note 1.

were left with the Catholics; and this 'might still be tolerable' if the latter could be sure of having even half the number for their share. But it was not to be expected that such would be the case. For 'we see and experience daily that, in spite of all oaths, seals, and letters, whenever the Religious Peace is opposed to their interests, they never think of abiding by it.' Wolfgang had rightly discerned that what the clamourers for emancipation in religious matters were secretly plotting was to get all the abbeys and bishoprics gradually into their hands.[1] 'We know,' he wrote, 'how they have acted hitherto, and how they have used emancipation first of all to get one foot into the abbeys and then to set up Lutheran bishops and to exclude all Catholics in perpetuity both from admission into the bishoprics and from all episcopal rule over them.' This was what happened in the imperial cities, as could be proved by numbers of instances; the result of the 'blasphemous measure of emancipation' would be 'that anything and everything would be free to the antagonists, while every scrap of liberty was taken away from the Catholics; for in the places where this franchise had been granted no Catholics were ever allowed to come. It was much to be wondered at and much to be deplored that there were timid politicians among us, who against their better judgment and consciences took upon themselves to advise the Emperor, the electors, and the princes that, owing to the conditions of the time, it was desirable to temporise and to wink at many things, although they might know and understand that it is entirely due to this political condoning and timidity that one bishopric after another—and

[1] See our remarks, vol. viii. 359-363.

therewith God and His religion—have been lost, and that the imperial cities also have entirely done away with religion.' 'We Catholics,' the Bishop says in conclusion, 'in our earnest endeavours to keep up our religion, must hold together like a firm and solid wall.' To this end 'all the Estates, temporal and spiritual, must instruct their ambassadors at the Diet at Ratisbon to make a particular point of unanimously supporting and defending the Catholic Church.' He himself should strive with all his might to bring about this unanimity, and, if need be, he was ready to stake life and body in the cause.[1]

An attempt of this sort to organise united defence of the rights of property was, forsooth, regarded as 'a bloodthirsty popish plot.' 'For veritable conspiracies and further acts of dispossessment,' said Edmund Schrader, 'they must look elsewhere than among the Catholics.' Pope Paul V. had charged the Emperor, the spiritual Electors, the bishops and the Catholic lay princes to oppose the schemes of the heretics at the Ratisbon Diet, and to insist on the surrender of the convents and Church possessions wrested from the Catholics in accordance with the decisions of the Imperial Chamber.[2]

At the wish of the Emperor the Pope withdrew the order that the nuncio at the court of Prague, Cardinal Antonio Gaëtano, should go to Ratisbon.[3]

[1] *Reichstagsakten*, p. 93, fol. 86–88, and 94, fol. 52–54. *Donauwörthische beständige Information* (1611), Beil. No. 125. See Schmidt, *Neuere Geschichte*, v. 263–267.

[2] Stieve, *Die Politik Bayerns*, ii. 903, 904. See the *Instruction für den Nuntius Gaëtano, Erzbischof von Capua*, in v. Egloffstein, pp. 114–118. See also Pieper, *Felice Milensio*, pp. 58, 153.

[3] *Gaëtanos Instruktion für Milensio*, in v. Egloffstein, p. 110. See

Cardinal Charles of Madrüz had urged the Archbishop Schweikart of Mayence at any rate 'to take into timely consideration' the restoration of the four convents and to exercise special skill in bringing forward the legitimate claims and in stating the offences committed, and to keep their importance in view by vigorous protest. 'Schweikart assured the Pope of his ready zeal, on November 25, 1607, only hinting at the difficulties in handling this matter;[1] but he had before signified to the Palatine Elector his willingness that it should be arranged between the Catholic and Protestant Estates that all the abbeys and convents confiscated by the latter since the Treaty of Passau should be left to them without further grudge, while on the other hand the Protestants gave the assurance that henceforth they would leave matters *in statu quo* and not make any further confiscations.'[2] But the Count Palatine would not agree to this. He insisted that the Protestants were to have a free hand in future also. If the Catholics, said Frederic IV. in his instructions to his ambassadors at the Diet, should propose an accommodation of this sort, they were to be answered that 'it was considered the most right and just course that all evangelical Estates—those already converted and those that should hereafter come over to the Protestant religion—should be allowed freedom to reform their own lands and all the abbeys and convents lying within their jurisdiction. Corresponding rights should also be the privilege of the Catholics.'[3]

Stieve, ii. 897; Pieper, *Felice Milensio*, pp. 59, 152; and Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 108.

[1] Stieve, ii. 901, note 1.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 604, and note 1.

[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 624. The Instructions are not re-

The evangelical Estates—so the Count Palatine insisted—must 'stand together like one man at Ratisbon,'

produced word by word. Gindely, *Rudolf II.* Bd. i. 159–160, gives the passage in question as follows: 'Only on condition of the Catholics conceding as a basic principle that in the future also all evangelical Estates shall be allowed to carry on reform (*i.e.* to abolish abbeys and convents, and force their own religion on the people) both in the domains already in their possession, and also in all that shall hereafter fall to them either by inheritance or by "some other way," and also that all Catholic Estates who became Protestants should at once, in like manner, have full power of reform in their own territories—only on these conditions can we enter into a fresh compact with the Catholics, to whom, be it said, we are ready to grant equal power to carry on reform in their own sense of the word.' Gindely adds: 'There can scarcely be anyone so unreasonable as to dispute the fact that these instructions of the Count Palatine afforded the Catholics full justification for not consenting to an expansion of the Religious Pacification of Augsburg after an amicable restoration of the Church property wrested from them since 1556. How could they be benefited by a treaty when their opponents with one breath declared: "What we have taken from you we shall keep, and anything more that we can take from you we shall take"? In the first place they extended their right of reform not only to their present possessions, not only to all others that should fall to them by inheritance, but also to all that should come to them "in some other way." It was this "other way" that had helped them to get possession of so many bishoprics immediately dependent on the Empire; this same "other way" it was to which they had had recourse only shortly before in the secularisation of the Electorate of Cologne, and which in plain language was nothing else than violence. And yet the originators and the representatives of the Palatine Instructions, men like Camerarius, Plessen, and above all the Prince of Anhalt, were not ashamed to thunder anathemas at Jesuitism, at Papism, at "that ruthless suppressor of 'evangelical truth,' Ferdinand of Graz"—they who themselves set up principles which took at least as little account of the liberty of conscience of the people as did those of the opposite party which they were never weary of abusing and exposing to shame. . . . In persistent, systematised oppression of their subjects' consciences, the German princes did not fall short of Philip II., and if he far exceeded them in the harshness of his measures, he did not by a long way come up to them in the presumption with which, in the determination of the religion of their subjects, they arrogated to themselves higher rights than even Popes and Councils. And yet how little has this been taken into consideration in compiling the history of the past, and how false above all has been the judgment passed on *the originators of the deadly contest* which for thirty years lacerated Central Europe! The Protestants, the final victors on the field of battle, have been also hitherto the conquerors on the battle-

and refuse the Emperor any grants of money until their 'grievances' have been redressed, *i.e.* until by the cancelling of the verdict on the four convent cases the confiscation of abbeys and Church property not immediately held from the Empire was recognised as lawful; by recognition of the Protestant administrators of bishoprics the ecclesiastical reservation was practically abolished, and the invalidity of the decrees of the majority in religion and in taxation acknowledged: at the very least the proceedings of the Imperial Aulic Council must be annulled. If this amount of 'satisfaction' was not obtained, 'the Estates must recall their ambassadors from the Diet.' [1]

The demands of Frederic IV. were supported by the majority of the Protestant Estates, who acted under the guidance of the Count Palatine's ambassadors.

The crucial matter for them was to win the Elector of Saxony to their side.

Christian II. had so far always shown himself an opponent to the Palatine revolutionary party; in the dispute concerning the four convents he had stood on the side of the Catholics, and he had by no means wished the authority of the Aulic Council to be abolished. But at the time of the Diet he assumed a position which 'the Palatiners and their adherents knew very well how to turn to their account,' and over which they 'sang loud jubilee.' [2]

field of literature; it is they who have written the history of the seventeenth century, and therein lies the reason of the false estimate of the Palatine party.'

[1] 'Verhandlungen mit Württemberg,' in Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 609–612, and the 'Kurpfälzische Instruction,' p. 621 ff.

[2] Letter of Schrader, March 5, 1608, to the Bartholomäusstift at Frankfort-on-the-Main.

During a sojourn at Prague Christian II. had spoken strongly to the Emperor against the idea of appointing the Archduke Ferdinand his representative at the Diet, for the Archduke 'was far too much under the influence of the Jesuits and their inflammatory counsels.' Christian declared that 'he would never let himself be seen in company with this persecutor of the truth.' He looked upon the execution of the sentence of the ban, for which in his opinion there had been so little cause, as a sign that the party 'which was too much in sympathy with Jesuitical intrigues' had gained the ascendency at the imperial court and among the Catholic Estates.[1] Even now, he said, his ambassadors at Ratisbon had reported to him that Ferdinand had quite lately been the guest of the Jesuits, that most of his councillors were ardent Catholics and friends of the Jesuits, and that 'they were acting in concert with the latter in many ways.'[2] The Landgrave of Leuchtenberg, one of the Archduke's councillors, had advised the Emperor to allow the Princes of Weimar and Altenburg only one vote, and they, the ambassadors, had been insulted by this Landgrave at a banquet with words and gestures. From such important occurrences the ambassadors felt certain that if a different turn were not given to things the Jesuits 'would before long bring about a bloody massacre in Germany.' In various places where the Protestants dwelt in the midst of the Catholics like 'sheep among wolves,' they were altogether crushed, while 'the popish abominations' were introduced with force and authority.[3]

[1] Stieve, *ii.* 900, note 3. Christian to the Emperor, January 1, 1608, Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 620; cf. v. Egloffstein, p. 33.

[2] Concerning Ferdinand's assistant councillors see v. Egloffstein, p. 28.

[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 630–631, note.

A preacher from Heilbronn, according to Schrader's report, in an address in the open market, exhorted the evangelical Estates 'to stand all together in unison, because in Heilbronn also the papists were bent on the suppression of the Divine Word, and the same might happen there as had happened at Donauwörth, and bloodshed was to be expected.' The conviction of this 'intended suppression of the Divine Word' rested on the fact that the commandēr of the Teutonic Kinghts, Charles, Baron of Wolkenstein, 'had had the audacity to hold Divine service with the church doors open in the principal street of the town. The town council there had reported the matter to the council at Frankfort-on-the-Main, at the end of December 1607. Ever since in Heilbronn, he wrote, 'by the illuminating grace of God the popish idolatry has been abolished, the Teutonic Knights have only been allowed to perform their so-called divine service within closed doors and for the benefit of their own people only.' Accordingly the council had interposed against this proceeding of Wolkenstein, had caused the church door to be barred each time, and now, as the council was apprised, a penal mandate for violation of the Religious Peace was to be obtained from the Emperor against the commander.[1]

'It would be enough, and more than enough,' Schrader heard the Heilbronn preacher declare in the public market place, 'if we tolerated these idolatrous papists in the towns and vouchsafed them even a look, for they are cursed and condemned by God Himself

[1] Despatches of December 18 and 28, 1607, in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, p. 93. fol. 230–233; cf. Senkenberg, ii. 530–531. For the penal mandate issued by the Emperor, see v. Egloffstein, p. 82, note 45.

as idolaters and blasphemers, and they are not worthy to see the light of the sun.' [1]

The ambassadors of the Elector of Saxony urged strongly on Christian II. that he owed it to conscience, duty, and posterity not to separate himself from the rest of the evangelical Estates in this most critical and dangerous extremity.[2] From other quarters also the Elector received admonitions. The Count Palatine of Neuberg, the Duke of Würtemberg, the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, and the Elector of Brandenburg sent him letter after letter pointing out to him, with reference to Donauwörth, that 'it had now come plainly to light that the papists, instigated by the Jesuits, were bent on nothing else than the root and branch extermination of Protestantism. There was therefore no way of escape than to bestir themselves without delay and press unanimously at the Diet for redress and security. The princes attempted to allay the suspicion that there was an idea of furthering the Palatine revolutionary plans by assurances that the 'one and only object was to maintain the Religious Peace and to secure the safety of the adherents of the true Augsburg Confession.' [3]

With regard to the Religious Peace which the Protestants were incessantly violating by the confiscation of bishoprics, abbeys, convents, and churches, a few pamphlets from the Catholic side had appeared in the Empire, in which the authors unmistakably disputed the perpetual validity and obligatory force of this treaty. These pamphlets had not proceeded from Jesuits,[4] but they were invariably attributed to them,

[1] In the letter cited above at p. 468, note 1.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 630–631.

[3] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 234, and also *Anmerkungen*, p. 85.

[4] We deal with this point in the second book, chapter v.

and it remained a fixed belief with the Protestants in general that the Order aimed at the repeal of the Religious Peace and at a bloody extirpation of all opponents. Christian II. was also of this opinion. 'We know, indeed,' he wrote to his ambassadors on January 21, 'that his Imperial Majesty and the peace-loving Catholic Estates are of too Christian and German a character to have any sympathy with these dangerous intrigues of the Jesuits and their adherents, still less to countenance the latter in the abolition of the Religious Peace, and therefore we impute no evil to them.' But the hostile machinations of the Jesuits must be forestalled in good time; and he could not grant the Emperor any help until the Religious Peace had been renewed and the evangelical Estates had received satisfactory assurance as to what they had to expect with regard to this treaty from 'the Jesuitical Catholics.' On February 4 the Elector repeated the statement that 'he could not accuse the Catholic Estates of violation of the Religious Peace, and therefore he did not require of them that they should renew their oaths of fidelity to it, but only that they should again ratify it in the Recess, as they had done in 1566, only this time with special mention of the Passau Treaty. Publishing literature and preaching sermons against the Religious Peace must also be forbidden in the Recess.' [1]

On February 14 the ambassadors of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne certified their consent to these demands brought forward by the ambassadors of the Elector of Saxony. In the report to the Emperor, or

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 635–636, note 1. See what the Elector of Saxony's ambassador, Brandenstein, said to Fachs, the chancellor of the Elector of Mayence, in v. Egloffstein, p. 57.

to his representative, there was to be a general reminder that 'in the next Recess not only were the Passau Treaty and the Religious Peace to be recorded again as briefly as possible, but also that a prohibition was to be included against the writing of books which were not in conformity with, or even intended to oppose, the Religious Peace, and which might cause disturbance and complications; this was to be forbidden under pain of the penalties stated in the police enactment of the year 1577.'[1]

'If it comes to a renewal of the Religious Pacification,' it is said in a confidential letter to the council at Frankfort-on-the-Main, February 27, 'the towns have already brought the higher Estates to allow that the treaty shall be interpreted in the sense they wish.' What the nature of this 'interpretation' was to be the Frankfort council had already long ago declared. 'Whereas by the terms of the Religious Pacification,' this council had said, 'freedom was granted to all the secular Estates to establish what religion they like in their own territories, there was manifest injustice in obliging the towns to tolerate the popish abuses side by side with the true religion. This state of things was grievous in the extreme, not only on account of the scandalous and unchristian abominations which the towns were obliged to see going on before their very eyes, but also because of the objectionable and schismatic doctrines and the manifold dangerous complications and troubles which these idolatrous practices engendered. They must therefore endeavour to arrange that the towns should have the same amount of religious liberty as the princes.'[2]

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 640.

[2] *Reichstagsakten*, pp. 66[b], fol. 14–21, and 67, fol. 27[b]. See our remarks, vol. vii. 130–132.

The Catholics, that is to say, were no longer to enjoy any toleration in the towns of mixed religions; this was the sense in which the Religious Pacification was to be understood.

At the council of princes the Protestant members supported the claims of the towns. On February 7 the towns of the Augsburg Confession withdrew from the deliberations with the declaration that they would take no further part in them 'until the grievances mentioned by them had been redressed, and freedom of religion granted to the burghers.' Several bishops remarked: 'As for the Religious Peace, we desire most earnestly that it should be kept in force, but that meanings should be put into it which are certainly not in it, this is not to be tolerated.' 'I hear at any rate this much,' said the Bishop of Spires, 'that the Protestants go on holding their secret meetings, and are planning and deliberating to the utmost of their power;' it is therefore 'in every way desirable that we also should combine together and keep the Religious Peace intact.' [1]

This admonition was not without result. The Protestant members of the council of princes had declared that first and foremost all their grievances—in matters of legal jurisdiction also—must be redressed; the next thing to consider was that the Jesuits looked upon the Religious Peace as only an interim compact which had been done away with by the Council of Trent, and that it was therefore necessary to begin by renewing this treaty. After these measures had been carried through, and not before, would they be able to give the Emperor

[1] 'Protocoll im Fürstenrate vom 29 Jan.-8 Feb. 1608,' in the *Frankfurter Reichstagsakten*, p. 92, fol. 181. See Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 195 ff., 208.

help against the Turks. To this the Catholic majority answered: 'As for the "regulation of the judicial system" and the renewal of the Religious Peace, the Protestants are the very people who have caused all the difficulties and troubles connected with these two matters; it is they who, by refusing to allow a revision of the four convent cases, have thrown the whole system of judicature into confusion; it is they also who, by their continued and incessant acts of confiscation after the conclusion of the Passau Treaty, have deliberately violated both this treaty and the Religious Peace, and disturbed the peace and order of the Empire. That the Catholics had never had any thought of treating the Religious Peace as no longer binding, they had abundantly testified both by verbal assurances and by deed and act; for they had instituted suits both at the imperial tribunal and in the Imperial Chamber on the basis of this Peace, and they had complained at Diets and on other occasions of the violation of the Peace and had demanded redress.

'In the year 1566 the Council of Trent had already long since been concluded, and yet in that year the ratification of the Religious Peace was recorded in the Recess of the Diet—a plain proof that this treaty was not considered to have been valid only up to the time of the Council. If the Protestants had no sinister intentions they would surely be satisfied to leave the question of the Religious Peace as it now stood. It was, however, plain to see that their insistence at this precise juncture, before even the settlement of the four convent cases, or a fresh ratification of the treaty of peace, meant that their intention was by this means to obtain tacit acknowledgment of the legality and justice

of all that they had done in violation of the treaty; their own arbitrary interpretation of the peace was to be ratified, and the Catholics were to be thrown under the general suspicion of having already undermined it, or at any rate of attempting to do so.' [1]

For these reasons the Catholic majority in the council of princes would only consent to a fresh ratification of the Religious Peace on condition of the introduction of the reserve clause 'that all that had been done on both sides in opposition to the said peace since the year 1555, all acts of violence or of occupation committed on arbitrary authority and without legal sanction by one or the other party, should be fully atoned for; and that henceforth nothing should be attempted in violation of the treaty.' [2]

'If this comes about,' wrote Archduke Ferdinand to his mother on February 16, 'the Protestants will have to give back Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Minden, Osnabrück, Bremen, Verden, and all the other churches they have taken; but, rather than risk such a consummation as this, they will no doubt prefer to lie low with this matter of the Pacification.' [3]

To the Protestant complaint concerning inflammatory and offensive Catholic publications, and also concerning the painting by the Jesuits at Prague,[4] the Bavarian ambassadors answered that 'with regard to

[1] Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* v. 285–287.

[2] v. Egloffstein, pp. 60–65, where an account of the origin of the reservatory clause is also given and the assertion refuted that the Catholics had thereby intended that 'all the ecclesiastical possessions lost to them since 1555 were at once to be restored and all other encroachments of the Protestants were to be fully retracted.' See Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 203 ff.

[3] Hurter, v. 429–430, February 16, 1608.

[4] See above, p. 117–118.

books and libellous pamphlets the Catholics had more cause to complain than the Protestants. For it was known everywhere what scandalous and infamous books and copperplate prints the latter published and were even now circulating for public sale. It was further known what an abominable pamphlet had been issued even here in Ratisbon or not far off. In this lampoon all the Catholic princes, spiritual and temporal, were included and were to be found, with their arms and names, under a banner of the wicked spirit, the devil, on which the bad thief was depicted. Even their Princely Serenities of Bavaria are caricatured with their own arms and those of their provincial Estates.' [1]

The clause proposed by the Catholic majority on the council of princes with regard to the Religious Peace provoked tremendous excitement among the Protestants. 'The Protestants,' wrote Edmund Schrader on February 23, 'actually went to make out that from this same clause it is palpably evident what tremendous persecution is being plotted against the evangelicals, and that it is necessary for them to take up arms at once in order to frustate the sanguinary popish conspiracies.' [2]

At a session of the electoral council it was demanded on February 22 by the Palatinate, Saxony, and Brandenburg, that the clause proposed by the council of princes, being of an offensive and highly dangerous nature, should not be included in the report to the imperial commissioners. The Brandenburg ambassadors said that if the Catholic princes and electors were determined to carry through this clause and the enforcement of

[1] Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 289–290.

[2] To the Bartholomäusstift at Frankfort-on-the-Main.

the ecclesiastical reservation, 'the best thing to be done was for each one of them to go back home and report on the matter, in order that they might be able to protect their own interests in the matter of the Religious Peace.' The ambassadors of the Count said that the object of the clause was to make the Protestants restore all the Church property that they had confiscated since 1555, and to guarantee to the Catholics security from any future confiscation of the sort; but that this was a matter requiring 'much reflection,' and they (the Protestants) for their part 'were not so simple that they did not know what was underneath all this.'[1] In a report to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria it was stated that the Protestant ambassadors had said that their princes must be fools if they thought of yielding to the Catholics even a hair's breadth in the matter of religion; if parity in religious matters was not consented to, then they must draw the sword.[2]

As it was found impossible to arrange an accommodation between the Estates, the Archduke Ferdinand, on March 17, submitted to them a mediatory document stating that 'some of the ambassadors of the council of electors and princes had demanded that a fresh ratification of the Religious Peace be recorded in the Recess of the Diet, but that the Catholics wanted to add to this ratification certain clauses against which the Estates of the Augsburg Confession were protesting. Now the Emperor proposed to settle the dispute by having the Religious Peace recorded afresh in the Recess in the form in which it had been drawn up in the year 1555 and

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 645–646. For the transactions at the council of princes and the council of electors, see v. Egloffstein, p. 66 ff., and Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 216 ff.

[2] v. Egloffstein, p. 75; cf. Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 267.

ratified in 1566, leaving aside the demands and amendments of either one or the other side, though without any intention of encroaching on the rights of either party.'[1]

The Catholics, who wished for peace, assented to this mediatory proposal; but it was not so with the Protestants. Some of them had meanwhile been carrying on zealous and successful transactions for the formation of a separate league and had gained a new associate in the Archduke Matthias, who had raised the standard of rebellion against the Emperor and was soliciting Protestant help.[2]

[1] Londorp, *Acta publica*, i. 48. For the fact that the mediatory proposal was made spontaneously by Ferdinand and his assistant-councillors, and not by command of the Emperor, see v. Egloffstein, p. 76, note 24. Ranke, in his *Deutsche Geschichte*, p. 164, says: 'An Augustinian brother, Fra Milensio, whom the nuncio had placed at the service of the Archduke Ferdinand, asserts in the most positive manner that the Emperor had wished to ratify the Religious Peace without that amendment (the clause of the council of princes) by which it would be as it were annihilated, and that he had given his warrant to this effect in a decree drafted on the subject. This decree had already arrived at Ratisbon, and the Archduke Ferdinand was inclined to be guided by it. Milensio claims for himself the credit of having prevented the realisation of this idea.' On a previous occasion, in his *History of the Popes* (3rd edition), ii. 401–403, Ranke had already discussed Milensio's report and commented as follows: 'If this is really the case, we must recognise the highly important place which this unknown Augustinian brother occupies in the history of our Empire. At the decisive moment he prevented the announcement of a concession which would probably have satisfied the Protestants.' However, as v. Egloffstein, pp. 97–104, has proved, in the whole of Milensio's narrative, dating from 1612, there is not one word of truth. Pieper also, in his *Felice Milensio*, p. 158, comes to the same conclusion. He adduces the whole of Milensio's correspondence with Rome, which is still preserved without a gap, and shows that there is no trace in these letters of any such decisive action on the part of Milensio. Milensio, by birth a Neapolitan, had a very lively fancy, to which he had given free play in his reports (*Ragguaglio*, &c.), which Ranke used without sufficient examination. Pieper, moreover, shows on thoroughly convincing grounds that Milensio's report was not compiled till the time of Urban VIII., probably in the year 1630.

[2] More on this subject in the following section.

Between France and the States-General an alliance had already been concluded in January, and on April 16 Oldenbarneveldt informed the Palatine ambassadors that the treaty with England was also nearly concluded; he urged that the German princes should also unite with the States-General.[1]

On April 15 it was resolved at the Protestant 'council of religion' to reject the 'interposition document,' for the reason especially that the Recess of 1566, which was alluded to, 'contained the very clause which was now being disputed.' Another reason was that 'this document mentioned the right of deciding the dispute in question, and this right they refused to allow to the Emperor in matters connected with the Religious Pacification.'[2]

'The Protestant Estates,' wrote Archduke Ferdinand to his mother on April 18, 'want to have a new Religious Peace, including the stipulation that they are not only to retain in their hands all the Church possessions seized by them since the conclusion of the Treaty of Passau, but that it should also be free to them in future to "reform" all the convents and bishoprics lying in their territories, and that no one should henceforth have any right of complaint against them. By reform of convents and bishoprics they mean entire confiscation. If they persist in this policy of theirs, nothing is more certain than that the dissolution of the Diet will follow, for the Catholics will never be able to consent to these terms with good consciences.' He had already assured his mother on March 12 that 'With

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 685.

[2] Protocol of the Council of Religion, in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 93 fol., 211 to 216. See v. Egloffstein, p. 86 ff., and Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 314 ff., 322 ff.

God's help he should do his utmost for the true religion, and that he would rather lose life, land, and people than consent to anything which might injure the Catholic faith.' [1]

Unexpectedly a 'formidable opponent' of the Count Palatine's party arose among the Protestants themselves. On April 24 Count Ludwig von Sayn-Wittgenstein, the head of the Palatine embassy, wrote to Christian of Anhalt that it was impossible to arrive at any satisfactory and final result: 'In spite of all their efforts they had lost the support of the Elector of Saxony, although his ambassadors would gladly do their best in the matter.' The Elector of Saxony had pronounced himself ready to accept the Emperor's document of mediation, which had been voted for by the Catholic majority of the council of princes and the three spiritual electors. He had done this in order to prevent the complete disruption of the Diet, for if this should happen, Christian II. feared that another Diet would not soon again be convened and that the dissolution of both the public and the religious peace would be the consequence. On April 15 he had forbidden his ambassadors to take any further part in the private meetings of the Protestant Estates because, he said, these proceedings led to mistrust among the Estates, and were more concerned with individual than with public interests and affairs.[2] 'The Palatiners and their party,' wrote Edmund Schrader, 'were inconsolable at the secession of the Elector of Saxony, who at first had supported them at the Diet, but had now raised the Catholic votes in the council of princes to a

[1] Hurter, v. 452–453, 500–501.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 651 note, 654 note.

majority, and would no doubt easily secure still more votes from among the rest of the Protestant Estates; fearing, therefore, such a possibility, they wanted to break up the Diet forthwith.'[1] Sayn-Wittgenstein expressed himself on the subject in his letter to Christian of Anhalt on April 24. He thought it a very serious matter that they no longer had the Elector of Saxony on their side. For 'not only the towns,' he said, 'but many others besides think very highly of the Elector and are under his influence.' For this reason the Diet, he said, should be broken up. 'In order to prevent open separation' among the Protestant Estates, but also 'from various other motives,' the ambassadors of the Palatine Elector were instructed to leave Ratisbon on the following Monday.[2] The Elector of Brandenburg had already charged his ambassadors to come to an agreement with the other Protestant Estates concerning the departure from Ratisbon.[3]

Among 'the many other motives' which, according to Wittgenstein, influenced the Palatines in dissolving the Diet, was the revolutionary rising of Archduke Matthias against the Emperor. The Archduke, as the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse had informed the French King Henry IV., had announced to the Estates at Ratisbon that he meant to begin his warlike undertaking on April 24. Moritz applied to the hereditary foe of the House of Habsburg for good advice.[4]

On April 25 Nuremberg informed the town delegates that the Protestant corresponding council had satisfied

[1] March 28, 1608, to the Bartholomäusstift at Frankfort-on-the-Main.
[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 654.
[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 661, note 1.
[4] Rommel, *Correspondence*, pp. 366–367.

itself that all the resistance hitherto opposed to the papists had been fruitless, for the Romanists had arranged everything with a view to the suppression of the evangelical Estates. The evangelical electors accordingly had, with the utmost secrecy, composed a document in which they recounted to the Emperor the story of the Diet and the reasons for which they could not remain any longer at Ratisbon. Their chief reason for wishing to leave was, they said, 'that they had been credibly informed that Archduke Matthias had raised the standard of rebellion and was stationed with his military forces two days' journey off from Prague.' In consequence of this the position of affairs had become so changed that further transactions would be useless. Nuremberg inquired whether the towns would be disposed to sign the aforesaid document; the signatures were to be placed in the Palatine chancellery as an official document. Strasburg declared itself ready to sign, but Frankfort-on-the-Main and Ulm made objections; as for the quarrel of the princes about the four convents, the towns, said the Frankfort ambassador, 'were not interested in it; it seemed as if war and insurrection might be occasioned in the Empire almost solely on this ground.' [1]

Without the assent of the towns, and without waiting to obtain the signatures of the Elector of Saxony and of the Saxon-Ernestine principalities, Lüneburg, Pomerania, Pfalz-Neuburg, and Hesse-Darmstadt,[2] the Palatine party, in order to hasten the dissolution of the Diet, sent in their document to Arch-

[1] 'Protocoll über Korrespondenz und Religionssachen,' in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 93 fol., 35–39.

[2] Senkenberg, xxii. 503, note 6.

duke Ferdinand on April 27 with the announcement that the ambassadors were enjoined to leave Ratisbon and to return home. Kurpfalz, Kurbrandenburg, Pfalz-Zweibrücken, Pfalz-Veldenz, Ansbach, Culmbach, Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Hesse-Cassel, Baden-Durlach, Anhalt, and the Counts of the Wetterau had signed the document and declared themselves innocent concerning all the troubles that had arisen. They had only wanted peace and unity. It was the Catholic Estates alone who had 'begun the contention and had been determined to go through with it; they alone deserved the blame of all the delays and all the complications which had prevented the Diet from fulfilling the wishes of the Emperor.' The Emperor, they urged, should see to it that these Estates 'desisted from their proceedings, which were so dangerous to the general life of the Empire,' and that 'the heavy grievances of the evangelical Estates, so often complained of, were redressed.' The bishoprics and other Church possessions, for whose restitution the Catholic Estates were contending, had been 'lawfully converted and confiscated.' The ambassadors hinted pretty plainly that, if necessary, the princes would also resort to violence in the assertion of their right to this property.[1]

With the utmost politeness and suavity Ferdinand endeavoured to detain the ambassadors until he had received the imperial decision concerning their missive. The Vice-Chancellor Leopold von Stralendorf, he told them, had been sent to Prague on this business, and would return very soon.[2]

The ambassadors, however, would not wait. The

[1] Londorp, *Acta publ.* i. 49–51; Wolf, *Maximilian*, ii. 293–298.
[2] Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* v. 292.

Palatiners and the Brandenburgers went off on April 29, and the others soon followed them.[1]

The Elector of Saxony expressed great displeasure at the departure of the Palatine and Brandenburg ambassadors. Their behaviour, he said, was a violation of the electoral union; it had caused a breach in the College of Electors, and increased the already existing mistrust; time would show how difficult it would be to reassemble the Estates. There had been a refusal to renew the Recess of 1566, which, after all, could not be abrogated; the reasons of this refusal were easy to divine; the pretexts which had been alleged could not be made 'to fit the case.'[2]

At the council of the towns the transactions reached a further stage. On April 28 the town of Strasburg, at the instigation of the Palatine ambassador, Ludwig Comerarius, laid before the town delegates for their adoption a manifesto, in which it was stated that 'at this last Diet their one aim and object had been to get the existing grievances once for all thoroughly redressed, and to maintain and propagate peace and tranquillity. But the adherents of the opposite religion, whom they called Roman Catholics, contrary to all expectation, had raised such a storm of debate, not only respecting the Religious Peace and all who were connected with it, but also concerning the system of justice, that the Religious Peace had been dislocated and the evangelicals threatened with the imposition of great and intolerable

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 653. The Brandenburgers added to the rudeness of their behaviour by going away, as the *Kurmainzer Protocoll* especially emphasises, '*insalutato hospite* (*i.e.* Archduke Ferdinand), and without giving a penny or a farthing in the customary tips or gratuities to anyone' (v. Egloffstein, p. 93).

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 654, note 1.

grievances never to be justified before God and posterity.' 'And whereas, under such stormy conditions, it was impossible for the Diet to arrive at any fruitful result, the electors and the princes had been impelled to inform themselves, through their councillors in the honourable towns, as to whether their lords and ruling authorities were resolved to abide steadfastly by the well-intentioned, salutary, useful convention and union which had been begun at Ratisbon solely for the maintenance of peace and good understanding.' [1] Strasburg advised that they should send in a declaration to this effect, 'subject, however, to the ratification of the superior authorities.' Lübeck, on the other hand, urgently recommended circumspection. Spires argued that, as everyone knew, 'it was only the higher Estates to whom the cases of the four convents were of great importance; the towns had no benefit to expect; moreover, it was well known what the higher Estates meant to do by means of this union, and how the Emperor would regard the manifesto when it became known. Frankfort took the same line as Spires, adding further that 'there had been no thought whatever of any counter-obligations on the part of the higher Estates towards the towns.' When several of the delegates advised mature deliberation, Strasburg urged emphatically that they had not much time for thinking, for the Palatine embassy intended leaving that very day. Nuremberg also urged caution, saying that a person of high position had remarked that they had better be careful not to incense the high and mighty ones; it was well known how things stood with the Emperor, and that he was at that very time afflicted with mental disease.

[1] *Frankfurter Reichstagsakten*, p. 93 ff., 221.

Very great changes were certainly at hand, changes in which the lesser folk would have the utmost to fear. To all appearances there would be an interregnum, which would perhaps last a long time; the Count Palatine would then administer the government of the Empire, and it was therefore advisable to conform to his wishes. When it became known in the course of the transactions that the manifesto to the Archduke Ferdinand had, without the consent of the towns, been signed 'in the name of all the evangelical Estates,' several of the delegates lodged complaints against this proceeding. A manifesto signed in this manner, Spires protested, might in future be used to justify all manner of things, as though it were the expression of opinion of a confederacy; they had not forgotten how 'it had fared with the good town of Constance after the Smalcald war, how badly the princes' promise of support had been kept.' Lübeck also alluded to the League of Smalcald, recalling the fact that, when the towns had gone a certain length with the confederates, the others had gone off on their own track, leaving the towns to swim by themselves as well as they could. Strasburg, on the other hand, thought there was no need for fear: the document only spoke of maintaining peace: if, however, it should come to war, none of the towns, even though they had substantial purses, could save themselves without troops, which the higher Estates would have to send them. Strasburg objected resolutely to the demand of Frankfort that the manifesto should be altered and modified in doubtful places: 'It was not suitable,' said Strasburg, 'that they should dictate to their superiors how they ought to write.' It would also seem as if the towns, should it come to real

earnest, meant to have nothing to do with the business. If a town had been helped once by the princes, and the priests humbled, what does it amount to? They may not do it a second time.

From fear of the Elector of the Palatinate as future Regent of the Empire, the document submitted by Strasburg was actually signed.

On May 3 the Catholic Estates addressed a concerted counter-declaration to the Archduke. They said that it was unjust to accuse them of having 'forced the Protestants into breaking up the Diet, and of having hindered the working of the assembly.' 'As for the much-desired ratification of the Religious Peace,' they said, among other things, 'we have all of us agreed that there is no such great necessity for this, because the said Religious Peace has always been faithfully and strictly adhered to by us Catholics; it has never been repealed or called in question; on the contrary, at every Diet and assembly of Deputies it has been re-acknowledged with promises that it should be observed inviolably and without diminution.' In order, however, that it should not appear as if they were afraid of a fresh ratification, they had consented to the measure on condition that full reparation should be made for all offences committed against the Religious Peace since 1555, and that everything should be restored to its former condition. They had made this stipulation 'chiefly in order that' the repetition and re-ratification of the treaty 'should not in any way produce the impression that by this measure all that had been done in violation of the Peace was also ratified and condoned; but, on the contrary, that to all those who considered that they had been oppressed and wronged, power should

be reserved to look after their interests and claim their rights and privileges.' Although, however, this was all right and fair in itself, and also in accordance with the decrees of the Empire and with the Religious Peace itself, the protesters had nevertheless plainly said that, unless this stipulation was withdrawn, they could not and would not take part in any further transactions or remain on any kind of relations with the opposite party. Such behaviour was contrary to all tradition, for at all times it had been the custom at all the Imperial Diets that when the council of electors and princes could not come to an understanding, the opinions on both sides should be laid before the Emperor or his plenipotentiaries. When the imperial 'Interposition' document had appeared, the Catholics, for the sake of the general well-being of the country and the maintenance of peace and unity, had accepted it unanimously, while the Protestants had repudiated it, and had refused to carry on any further relations if the Catholic reform clause were not removed, all claims to the confiscated convents and Church property renounced, and other demands which were prejudicial to the Catholics—above all to the Emperor—granted. From this behaviour it was plain to see whose was the fault of the obstructions and the fruitlessness of the Diet. 'The reform clause had to be insisted on on account of the other party's behaviour, neither could the Catholic Estates renounce all the advantages which the Religious Peace and the Recesses, especially that of 1566, afforded those who had been wrongfully oppressed, especially as these conditions were in no way meant to be prejudicial to any one Estate.' 'Never at any time and in any way' had the Catholic Estates treated the

Protestants 'in opposition to justice, or tradition, or used violence against them to enforce the terms of the Religious Peace, and in future also they on their part intended to abide firmly and inviolably by the said Peace, and never to commit any offence against any one in violation of it.' [1]

The Donauwörth affair, which, before the beginning of the Diet, had given rise to such a storm of reports concerning 'the bloodthirsty popish plots and designs,' played a very subordinate part at the Diet itself. The Palatine party had only made use of the business in order to gain supporters for the contemplated Protestant League. In the manifesto of April 27, in which the Palatiners brought forward their grievances, connecting the latter with the dissolution of the Diet, Donauwörth was not even mentioned. The only notice in the interest of this town that occurred was in a written statement sent to the Emperor on March 24 by the Protestants, in which it was said that the whole proceedings against Donauwörth were illegal, and gross violations of the Religious Peace and the Public Peace, as well as of the constitution of the Empire and the circles. That the Catholics of that town had been in any way suppressed by the council and robbed of their rights, the Estates could not see; on the contrary, they declared that 'the Council had in every respect conformed to the Holy Religious Peace;' 'not aggressively, but only in defence and for the maintenance of the traditional civic liberties' a few burghers had made

[1] Wolf, ii. 298–307. The Catholic Estates—so the Bavarian ambassador reported to Munich—felt themselves in duty bound to refute 'the shameless declaration of the Protestants, which was wholly at variance with facts,' in order to escape the reproaches of contemporaries and of posterity (v. Egloffstein, p. 94).

a stand against the encroachments of the abbot of Heiligenkreuz. For all that had happened later on they, the evangelical Estates, 'could not but blame those who, beginning with this poor humble town, were only too glad to kindle a fire which would blaze up and spread till in time it had enveloped other and more important evangelical cities: the aim of such people was to get the thin end of the wedge into the Religious Peace and finally annul it altogether, when everything else would fall to pieces.' 'In Christian pity' the Estates were bound to espouse the cause of the oppressed town, and to beg of the Emperor that before the close of this Diet he would restore it, both ecclesiastically and politically, to the same condition which it enjoyed before all the disturbances.[1]

The Brandenburg ambassadors had already, on March 28, pointed out to their Elector the advantages of a dissolution of the Diet. Before the Emperor summoned another Diet the Estates might have time to combine in a union of such sort 'that they would henceforth have no need to fear any division, and that they would all act together on one line of instructions and would all vote in the same way,' 'if, that is to say,' the ambassadors added, 'there should be any more Diets.'[2] Count Ludwig of Sayn-Wittgenstein spoke hopefully to Christian of Anhalt on April 24. 'Although it seems at present,' he wrote, 'as if nothing would be accomplished here, I hope, nevertheless, that after this commotion and the break-up of the Diet, we shall settle down before long into a better state of things,

[1] Wolf, ii. 317–329. For the transactions carried on by the Estates prior to the compilation of the manifesto, see Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 655–657; Lossen, *Donauwörth*, p. 58 ff.; Stieve, *Ursprung*, pp. 252–260.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 661, note 2.

and that the clergy will come to an amicable understanding about the Religious Peace and the affair of the convents.' [1]

'Everything here,' wrote a Catholic eye-witness of the proceedings at Ratisbon, 'is at a standstill, and in a state of confusion, and a word would be enough to bring on war. God have pity on us and on the country at large!' [2]

The plans of the Palatine revolutionary party were substantially furthered by the rebellion of the Archduke Matthias, by which the Imperial House of Habsburg was threatened with complete overthrow.

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 654.

[2] v. Egloffstein, p. 96.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE FRATERNAL QUARREL OF THE HOUSE OF HABSBURG—A PROTESTANT LEAGUE CONCLUDED

A FRESH insurrection had broken out in Hungary in 1607 before the imperial government had equipped itself for the new war which was contemplated. Illeshazy, Thurzo, and other chiefs of the Calvinistic party informed the Archduke Matthias that they would no longer recognise the Emperor as King of their country. The Turks at the same moment threatened to invade Austria and Styria, and to devastate the lands. Again and again Matthias urged the Emperor, as the means for warfare were exhausted, to confirm the treaties of peace concluded between the Hungarians and the Turks.[1] But Rudolf would not consent to do this unless the fortresses of Gran, Canisza, and Erlau were given back by the Turks. Of Matthias, whom he suspected of secret alliances with the enemies, he spoke in contemptuous language; he had moreover greatly incensed him by choosing the Archduke Ferdinand, instead of himself, as imperial representative at the Diet.[2] And thus it came about that Matthias took the desperate step of throwing himself into the arms of the revolutionary party in the Austrian hereditary lands. 'I fear,' wrote Ferdinand from Ratisbon to his mother, 'that the two brothers will never be on good terms again,

[1] See above, p. 426, 427. [2] Rommel, *Correspondence*, p. 368.

and this may cause great harm to Christendom.' 'It is certain that his Majesty has sinned against Matthias in many respects, but it does not behove the Archduke to revenge himself in such an unwarrantable manner.' The Archduke's conduct 'is very displeasing to the Catholics, but the Lutherans are triumphant over it.' 'It is said,' he reported on April 5, 'that the Evangelicals, as they call themselves, are eagerly watching for the result of the Hungarian business.' [1]

In order to rob his sick brother of his hereditary dominions, Matthias joined the League which had long been under preparation between the chiefs of the Calvinistic party in Hungary and their co-religionists in Moravia and Austria, and which was finally concluded in December 1607.

Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia, wrote Karl von Zierotin, the leader of the Moravian Calvinists, on December 9, 1607, are smarting under a common yoke of slavery: no ordinary measures will suffice to remedy the evil. 'The malady is deep-seated; it requires drastic medicine. A Moses is wanted to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, for the heart of Pharaoh is hardened! Abraham drove out the Assyrians, Gideon the Moabites, Cyrus gave freedom to the Jews, and what victories did not the glorious Maccabees accomplish!' [2]

George Erasmus, Baron of Tschernembl, to whom this summons to a war of religion was addressed, with the two brothers Gottfried and Richard von Starhemberg, constituted 'the Calvinistic triumvirate' in Upper Austria, and had been since 1606 in alliance with Prince Christian of Anhalt, the actual leader of the Palatine

[1] Hurter, v. 424, 429, 436, 485, 495. [2] Chlumecky, i. 398.

revolutionary party.[1] At the end of December 1607 the Austrian and Moravian chiefs of parties assembled at Rositz, a castle belonging to Zierotin, and organised with solemn oaths a united enterprise against the Emperor: the Austrians first, and then the Moravians, were to join the insurrection in Hungary. 'You who sit at the helm,' Zierotin said to the Austrians, 'must steer the ship.' Matthias was informed of the League by Zierotin's brother-in-law, afterwards the renowned Albert of Waldstein, Duke of Friedland.[2] In concert with Tschernembl and Illeshazy he summoned the Estates of Hungary and Austria to a Diet at Pressburg in January 1608. Rudolf II. ordered the assembled members to disperse forthwith, whereupon they passed the resolution 'to maintain the Vienna and Zsitva-Torocker Peace of 1606, with person and property against each and every one, and therefore also against the Emperor.' Matthias ratified the resolution and joined the League of the Austrians and Hungarians. In March the Protestant princes engaged themselves definitively not to grant the Emperor any imperial

[1] Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 169; Fr. Bernd, *Zur Gesch. der österreichischen Unruhen* 1608 *und* 1609, report of the Upper Realschule at Krems, 1876. Tschernembl, so H. v. Egloffstein opines, 'is the man in whom the opposition of the Estates to the House of Habsburg was as it were embodied, and who preceded his colleagues—those of Upper Austria especially—for a considerable period in resistance to the territorial princes. . . . He is the perfect representative of the squirearchy of his time, in the high-handed, brutal, and bragging nature of his outward demeanour, as well as in the low and self-seeking disposition of his mind' (*Zeitschr. für allgem. Gesch.* iv. [1887], 703).

[2] Ritter, *Quellenbeiträge zur Gesch. Rudolfs II.*, in the sessional Reports of the Academy of Munich, Historico-philosophic Class 1872, p. 263, note 31; Chlumecky, i. 399; Gindely, i. 183; Huber, iv. 487, note 2, does not consider it quite certain that Matthias had been informed of the Rositz resolutions.

subsidies at the Diet at Ratisbon.[1] Moravia was to be influenced by Zierotin to join the League, and was also to be a centre for the intrigues in Bohemia and Silesia. In Moravia it was actually hoped that Christian of Anhalt, who had been informed of all the proceedings, would, if necessary, come to the help of the movement with Palatine-French troops.[2]

Bohemia also was to be won over. At the head of the Protestant party there, in addition to Zierotin's most intimate associate, Wenzel Budowec von Budowa, to the Count Matthias of Thurn, and to Wenzel von Kinsky, was 'the notorious voluptuary and grand alchymist,' Peter Wock von Rosenberg. In the year 1607 Rosenberg had entered into closer relations with Christian of Anhalt, and at the latter's instigation had solicited the Elector Palatine to organise a league of all the Protestants 'against the dangerous plots and intrigues of the enemies;' he had also already placed at Prince Christian's disposal considerable sums towards the common object.[3] In October 1607 Tschernembl and Zierotin were made acquainted by a privy councillor of Rosenberg with the plans of the Protestant princes respecting the formation of a league.[4]

'Everything was planned with a view to the overthrow of the House of Habsburg;' but Archduke Matthias, in his blindness and his thirst for revenge against the Emperor, regarded the enemies as his trusted friends. He expressed the hope to Rosenberg that the Bohemian Estates would attach themselves to the Hungarians and 'would not henceforth allow the Emperor so long

[1] Chlumecky, i. 400–402; Huber, iv. 489 ff.; Klopp, i. 44.
[2] Chlumecky, i. 420–421. [3] Gindely, *Rudolf I.*, pp. 142–143.
[4] Chlumecky, i. 397.

a bridle.' Rosenberg was also solicited to gain the interest of his friends among the German princes, and on February 18, 1608, he willingly communicated to the Prince of Anhalt and the Elector Palatine the substance of the Pressburg transactions.[1] On March 9 he wrote to Christian that he had made known at Prague in no honeyed language that if Rodolph would not agree to the demands of Hungary, Austria, and the Archduke, 40,000 Heiducks (Hungarian infantry, originally cowboys) would appear before Prague and drive out the Emperor. In such a case, he added, the Count Palatine 'would come to great honour.'[2]

As early as 1603 there had been talk of placing a Protestant King on the throne of Bohemia.[3]

When Archduke Ferdinand received the news at Ratisbon of the Pressburg League he wrote to his mother on February 14 that he could not believe that Matthias was so bereft of his senses as to adopt such criminal and punishable resolutions in defiance of God and of international rights.[4]

Matthias went still further. He summoned a provincial Diet at Vienna, and on February 24 laid the Pressburg resolutions before the Nether Austrian Estates for their acceptance, at the same time demanding that the land should equip a considerable number of troops. Despite the opposition of the prelates and the town delegates, and of several Protestant nobles also, he carried his measures through. With the Upper Austrian Estates he achieved his object much more easily, owing to the exertions of Tschernembl. After he had written to Christian of Anhalt on February 18, he

[1] Gindely, i. 185–186.
[2] Chlumecky, i. 422.
[3] Gindely, i. 180.
[4] Hurter, v. 426.

despatched the Calvinist Richard von Starhemberg, who had long been on a friendly footing with the Calvinists, to Germany, in order to try to gain the support of Christian, of the Elector Palatine, the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, and other princes in the insurrection against the Emperor. In March Starhemberg was negotiating with the Palatine ambassadors at Ratisbon.[1] It was arranged that Richard's brother Louis should have the task of commending the Archduke's enterprise to the Electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg; Matthias even sent an ambassador to the ecclesiastical electors.[2] 'The Archduke's qualifications are bad,' said the Elector Schweikart of Mayence to Christian of Anhalt on March 17; 'when the Hungarians no longer want him, they will take the mannikin by the neck and lead it to Constantinople, and set up an Illeshazy in its place.'[3]

The qualifications of 'the criminal, high-born insurgent,' as the Elector of Cologne designated the Archduke, were so bad at any rate, that, in order to justify himself and to make a public exposure of the other archdukes, he had no scruple in revealing the family contract of April 1606, although he had solemnly sworn to keep it secret. Archduke Ferdinand entertained the suspicion that Matthias would endeavour to seduce the Protestant Estates of Styria from him.

And in fact he was not innocent of attempts of the sort. The Protestant Estates, however, conducted themselves honourably. The governor-general of the province and the other delegates vowed that they would remain true to the Archduke till death. 'Although they are

[1] Municipal protocol in the Frankfort *Reichstagsakten*, 92 fol. 20.
[2] Gindely, i. 188–189. [3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 678.

heretics,' Ferdinand wrote to his mother on March 1, 'I have never doubted their fidelity, and still do not doubt it in the least.' And on April 18 he wrote: 'I am heartily glad that my Styrians have remained so faithful.' [1]

In February Matthias began comprehensive preparations in Austria and Hungary for a campaign against the Emperor. He was assured of the co-operation of Moravia. In March the Moravian grandees, who, like those of Austria, aimed at unlimited rule by the nobles, deposed the imperial provincial governor, against the will of the clergy and the towns, set up a provisional government, joined the League of Pressburg, and summoned Matthias to rise against the Emperor.

The Emperor meanwhile wavered helplessly in this direction and that, and sought to deaden his anxiety by immoderate indulgence in spirituous liquor. His mental condition grew so much worse from the beginning of 1608 that at times his gestures were like those of a frenzied lunatic. One day he attempted to cut his throat with pieces of broken glass; another time he ran up against the horns of a stag in the hopes of sustaining a mortal injury; not without ground was it feared that he might put an end to himself by means of poison. The ambassador of the Archduke Albert found the state of things at the castle 'so full of horror' that he would not trust it to pen and ink, but narrated his experiences later on by word of mouth.[2]

As the Emperor had only slight military forces at his disposal,[3] his secretary, Hannewaldt, urged him to

[1] Hurter, v. 442, 483, 500.
[2] Hurter, v. 97–99; Gindely, *Rudolf I.*, pp. 192–193.
[3] Gindely, i. 191, 221, note 2.

resort to other means for bringing about the complete annihilation of the insurgent nobility in Austria, Hungary, and Moravia. He advised him to declare the nobles of these lands guilty of high treason, to confiscate all their property, to set free all their subjects, freemen and bondmen, burghers and peasants, and to make them immediate subjects of the Emperor, and to arm the royal towns against the rebel nobles.[1]

But the Papal nuncio and the Spanish ambassador were of a different opinion, and on their representations Rudolf declared himself ready in this his urgent need to accept unconditionally the terms of peace concluded by Matthias in 1606 with the Hungarians and the Turks, and to grant the insurgents remission of punishment.

Matthias, however, who had now become a tool in the hands of the Calvinist party leaders, Illeshazy, Zierotin, and Tschernembl, rejected the Emperor's proposals and summoned the Estates of Bohemia and Silesia on May 4 to a Diet at Czaslau, where, in conjunction with the delegates of Hungary, Moravia, and Austria, they were to organise political affairs on a fresh basis.

Prince Christian of Anhalt was so confident that he expressed to the Elector Palatine the hope that the coming complications would bring about the 'heaven-decreed' destruction of the House of Habsburg.[2] He still adhered to the plan that Archduke Maximilian was to receive Bohemia and then become an emperor dependent on the Palatine revolutionary party. He had actually, in the middle of March, gained the assent of the Elector of Mayence to the elevation of Maximilian. This short-sighted prince of the Church, who

[1] Gindely, i. 193.

[2] Gindely, i. 210.

did not see through the real intentions of the party, had assured him that he would promise the Count Palatine on his oath not to deviate from the counsel that had been decided on, but to abide by it even if changes should occur, and to confer with the Palatine, rather than with his spiritual co-electors, as to what was to be done.[1]

But the Bohemians did not want 'a new king of any sort' forced upon them, neither Maximilian nor Matthias. When the latter arrived at Czaslau on May 10 he found none of the Bohemian or Silesian Estates present. 'The unfortunate secular chief of Christendom scarcely knows any longer where to lay his head in peace.' In vain did Rudolf beg the Electors of Saxony for shelter at Dresden. The news of the dissolution of the Diet at Ratisbon filled him with despair. On May 8 he told Matthias that he was willing to give him unlimited government over Hungary and Austria in his (Rudolf's) name, also to allow him the reversion of the crown of Bohemia; he was even ready to help his brother to secure the imperial throne. Matthias, however, wanted still more than this. In his own and his confederates' names he demanded the delivery of the Hungarian crown, in order that it might be placed at once on his head, and also that Moravia might be given into his possession, because this country was allied with Hungary and Austria; with regard to Bohemia he insisted on the immediate transfer of the sovereign authority. On May 10 he stood with his

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 680. 'Incipiebat,' Christian further says in his memoirs on the transactions with the Elector, 'que Palatin avoyt impression de France, et vouloit inferer vers moy quelque chose, mais je le detournois, qu'il oublioit. Gesta: Consentit nobiscum in consiliis nec illa mutavit. Confidentia sancta.'

army in Böhmisch-Brod, only four miles from Prague. The helpless Emperor made fresh overtures. He was ready to confer on his brother full possession of Hungary and Austria with all attendant rights and honours, to convene the Bohemian provincial Diet, and to propose to the members that the Archduke should be named successor in the Empire. But even this did not satisfy Matthias. He demanded further at least that Rudolf should cede Moravia to him, and actually also should defray the costs of an insurrection directed against himself. Matthias was not ashamed of extorting 400,000 florins from the Emperor for the pay of the army with which he had invaded Bohemia.

Physically and mentally broken down, Rudolf opened a provincial Diet on May 23, and proposed to the Estates to nominate Matthias 'Reversioner of the Kingdom.' But here again he was met at once with the most far-reaching exactions. At the suggestion of Budowec the Protestant members enumerated in twenty-five articles the grievances which must first be redressed. The first article was as follows: 'All Bohemians, including the peasant serfs, must be allowed complete religious freedom, and everyone must have the right to build churches on his own ground.' It was further exacted, among other things, that all clerical posts, all offices and dignities must only be filled with Bohemians, and that the Estates must be free to summon provincial diets without the permission of the King. On May 24 the Estates signified that they were resolved not to budge from these demands, and, according to ancient usage, to throw out of the window anyone who should oppose them.

On the following day Zierotin and Tschernembl

presented themselves at the provincial Diet in order to complain, as ambassadors of Archduke Matthias and under his instructions, of the bad government of Rudolf, and to insist that Matthias must be raised to the throne in his stead, and that they must bring the business to a conclusion by joining the allied countries. The Elector of the Palatinate, through Zierotin and Tschernembl, had urgently advised the Archduke to enter into alliance also with Henry IV. Matthias accordingly intimated his readiness to negotiate on the subject, and Zierotin began transactions with the French ambassadors at Prague. The fraternal quarrel was a very welcome occurrence to the French King, and in order to prolong it as much as possible he wished to withhold his interference. His ambassador therefore began by giving Zierotin an evasive answer, but later on he assured him that Henry IV. took great delight in the Archduke's successes.

In Bohemia, however, Matthias did not accomplish his end. On May 31 the Emperor gave the Protestant Estates a written assurance that he consented to all their demands, with the exception of the article which concerned religion; a special provincial Diet, he said, should be convened within a few months to consider this last point.

In consequence of these concessions of the Emperor, the Estates informed the Archduke's ambassadors that they could not assent to the dethronement of Rudolf; Matthias must content himself with the possession of Hungary and Austria and the reversion of the Bohemian crown lands, and must withdraw his army from Bohemia as soon as possible. This army, which was to free the inhabitants from 'the miserable rule' of the Emperor,

robbed and plundered as though in an enemy's country; all the villages in the neighbourhood of Prague had been turned into heaps of ashes.

After Rudolf had ceded Moravia also to Matthias, the latter consented to form a treaty with 'his beloved brother' on June 25, and began his retreat from Bohemia.

In his camp at Sterbohol, Zierotin, Tschernembl, Gottfried and Richard von Starhemberg, Stanislaus and Nicholas Thurzo, and other Calvinist representatives of Moravia, Austria, and Hungary had already, in all secrecy, on June 29, concluded among them a league for mutual succour in case any obstacles of a religious nature should make it impossible for them to render allegiance to their new king and lord, Matthias. The confederates also agreed to consider as to the best means of drawing the princes and Estates of Silesia into the union.[1]

Such was the fruit which Matthias reaped from his insurrection. All discerning persons saw beforehand that for the violator of the public peace 'the worst days were still in store with his so-called friends,' and also with his 'friends' in the Empire, the Palatine party, through whose exertions, meanwhile, the long-wished-for Protestant League had become a *fait accompli*.

'The bloody popish intrigues and plots,' which had no existence whatever in fact, but which had engrossed the imaginations of the Protestants at the beginning of the Ratisbon Diet, had also greatly perturbed the Elector of Brandenburg. His ambassadors had reported

[1] Fuller details as to what was transacted are given in Chlumecky, i. 459–502; Hurter, vi. 1–68; Gindely, i. 211–234; Hammer, ii.; *Urkundensammlung*, pp. 216–217, No. 229; Huber, iv. 506 ff., 515.

to him how 'very shortly, by the machinations of the hellish viper brood of Jesuits;' everything 'would go to pieces.' In 'all the advices which came from Italy' there was mention of 'formidable preparations on land and sea;' also, a Protestant nobleman who was in the service of the Bishop of Würzburg had received 'such extraordinary news' that he had tried to be set free from his post, for he would not 'help to fight against his co-religionists.' Thus in all directions 'poor Germany and the Church of God, already sufficiently distraught, were menaced by extensive intrigues; it was therefore most urgently necessary to think about a new Smalcaldian League.'[1] Reports of this nature drove the Elector Joachim Frederic to the firm conviction that if the Ratisbon Diet broke up without 'coming to an accommodation,' there would be no alternative but recourse to arms.[2] During the last five years he had taken no further part in the transactions concerning the Protestant League, and on February 20, 1608, he had given the Elector Palatine his reasons for withdrawing. 'After the example of his father,' he said, 'he had been disposed to protect the decaying system of the Empire as long as it was possible, rather than to demolish it;' 'with the most illustrious House of Austria' it was at that time his desire 'to renew the ancient friendly relations.'[3] Now, on the contrary, to the joy of the Palatines he became the chief promoter of a Protestant League. He proposed a gathering of all the Protestant princes in person with a view to the formation of a union. His ambassadors, he said, before

[1] See above, pp. 468-469, and Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 658-660.
[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 661, note 2.
[3] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 371, note 3, 277.

leaving Ratisbon should arrange this much with the Palatiners and the other princes' ambassadors, that their lords would hold a Diet, perhaps at Erfurt. The Hessian ambassador, Otto Wilhelm von Berlepsch, reported on March 31 from Ratisbon to Cassel that the Elector of Brandenburg was so active in the organisation of the League that he meant also personally to canvass the Elector of Saxony on the subject.[1]

Christian of Anhalt was still more active. 'In the memory of man,' he said in a memorandum, 'it has never before happened that the evangelical Estates, both high and low, have stood together, as now, like one man; therefore they must seal the union without delay; the members already united at Ratisbon must appoint a committee which, at the end of the Diet, should settle the extent of the sums to be contributed for the accomplishment of their purpose.' Accompanied by the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach, Christian repaired to Stuttgart to the funeral of Duke Frederic of Würtemberg, who had died on February 8, and entered into negotiations there with the new duke, John Frederic, and with several other princes; he had brought with him a charter of the League which had been drafted in 1606 according to the proposals of the French King, Henry IV.[2] But still the Elector of Saxony, the Duke of Würtemberg, and the Count Palatine of Neuburg fought shy of a union with the Calvinists. In order to remove this obstacle the Palatine Elector, on March 17, commissioned his ambassador to the States-General, Hippolyt von Colli, to

[1] Wachenfeld, p. 29.

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 666, note 1, 667–672; *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 250–252. Concerning Duke Frederic of Würtemberg, see Stieve, *Briefe und Akten*, vi. 252.

represent to the English and Danish ambassadors that their two sovereigns 'might greatly help on this urgently needed union' by exhorting those three princes not to let themselves be hindered by religious misunderstandings.[1]

Towards the close of the Diet, as at its beginning, the most monstrous reports of 'popish plots' were set about. 'In all seriousness,' wrote Edmund Schrader on April 21, 'the Nuremberg ambassador has been heard to say these last days that there were at least a hundred Jesuits in disguise acting as servants to butchers, bakers, and shopkeepers at Ratisbon, and that the evangelicals must beware of poison in their food, as the Jesuits were known to be the most expert mixers of poison.' 'The Jesuits were also at work in connection with a formidable popish league among the Catholic Estates, and there was no security but that the Duke would one day unexpectedly fall upon the town and drive out the evangelicals.'[2] There were special indications, the ambassador said, of this probability. 'Ratisbon, it was rumoured, was filling with Lotharingian beggars, who had possibly disguised themselves in this manner in order to combine with the troops that Bavaria was recruiting in striking a blow.' At the same time it was noised about that 'Bavaria was equipping a large army in order to invade Austria in the Emperor's name and to exterminate the evangelical religion there.'[3]

'In very truth,' wrote Edmund Schrader, 'we are living in times when it may be asked whether among

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 681.

[2] To the Bartholomäusstift, at Frankfort-on-the-Main.

[3] Stieve, *Ursprung*, p. 244. See Pruckmann's reports in Ranke, *Zur deutschen Gesch.* pp. 278–279.

many hundred heads there are to be found half a dozen or even one or two in which there are any traces of healthy human understanding; the minds of men are so excited and worked up that they are ready to believe the most preposterous things.' 'An intellectual network of this sort, where the souls of men are ensnared, would have been inconceivable to our dear forefathers, whose souls rest in God.' [1]

The pretended 'truly bloodthirsty designs' of the papists were made use of for promoting the Protestant League.

This, for instance, is what happened at Würtemberg. The provincial Estates warned the Duke against the Union, saying that such confederacies had often done little good, but, on the contrary, had brought great dangers and difficulties on land and people, and even on the rulers themselves. They begged at any rate that the Duke 'would not enter into agreement with the Calvinists and others, but only with those princes and Estates who professed the pure Augsburg Confession;' also they urged that 'the League in question must not clash with his Imperial Majesty and the decrees of the Empire.' John Frederic answered that with regard to the League 'he himself had had in view the reasons why the province had objected to it, but all the same he could not see his way to separating himself from it without grave danger, for the course of affairs in the Empire, owing to the bloodthirsty intrigues of the Jesuits, was more alarming at present than it had ever been.' The proceedings against Donauwörth and the 'concomitant imperial transactions' showed plainly that the papists there had no scruples whatever

[1] In the letter cited above, p. 489, note 1.

in tampering with the Religious Peace, in using force and cunning to draw back to their side all the convents and bishoprics that had been reformed, and all the emoluments belonging to them, and in perverting churches and schools.[1] The people of Würtemberg were thrown into terror by a new sensational paper in 1608, which gave an account of 'a crafty Jesuit who was in league with the devil and could make himself invisible or hide in a small magic ring, who had already set out with a number of priests and monks in order to stir up the popish country people, to put an end to the Duke and all his councillors, servants, preachers, and officials, and to reintroduce everywhere the scandalous papistical Mass; it was therefore urgently necessary that the evangelical princes, like the servants and prophets of the Almighty and the noble Maccabees of old, should be on their guard, and should combine together in a Christian and loyal union and a patriotic German confederation for the glory of God and the crimson blood of Christ, and noble German liberty. . . . And all persons who oppose such a union or complain of the costs might well be regarded as secret papists, as cringing courtiers of the Antichrist, and be held in such evil odour that the ruling authorities be compelled to keep strict watch over them and to deal with such carrion as they think fit. Therefore let everyone have a care, for the rulers do not bear the sword in vain. Amen.'[2]

[1] Sattler, v. 8-9.

[2] 'A new, veritable, and alarming account of projected bloody deeds of the Jesuits in Wirtenberg, and printed at *Pfaffenfeindhausen* ['the house of the enemy of priests'] 1608.' These same bloody deeds were, as is said further on, happily prevented, because, on their journey thither, their leader and master and inspirer was suddenly carried away into the air

In consequence of a threatening letter from the Emperor to the Count Palatine, Philip Louis of Neuburg, summoning him to surrender all the property he had confiscated at Donauwörth and forbidding any more such infringement of the rights and possessions of the town, the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Ansbach 'declared the downfall of the liberty of the Fatherland' to be close at hand.[1] Wolfgang Wilhelm, the son of Philip Louis, saw in this letter the germ of an appallingly threatening storm; the papists were manifestly determined to root out one evangelical Estate after another. Philip Louis urged Christian of Anhalt to organise a union on such a basis that it should be able from the outset to maintain an army of 20,000 men for three months.

On May 12, 1608, Christian, as representative of the Count Palatine, the Margrave Joachim Ernest of Brandenburg-Culmbach, Duke John Frederic of Würtemberg, and the Margrave George Frederic of Baden-Durlach met together in the Ansbach village of Ahausen. Philip Louis of Neuburg had sent his son as representative. On May 16 they formed a league which for many years to come exercised a far-reaching influence on the destiny of the Empire.

Nominally this League was only organised 'for defence;' its true object, however, was to fight for the retention of all that had been unlawfully taken from the Catholics since the Religious Pacification of Augsburg, and similarly to support any further encroachments by the Protestants.

amid a horrible stench, at which all the others were seized with such terror that they dispersed like dust, and so the land of Wirtenberg was saved from all the popish idolatry and the stinking Jesuitical carrion.

[1] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 686.

It was necessary that this Union should have a director at its head, and the Elector Palatine was chosen as its chief for the first three years. Next in authority to him a lieutenant-general was appointed, who was to have the chief command of the troops of the League. This army was not to consist of the troops of the different members of the League, but of mercenaries levied in the name of the confederates and with the money contributed by them. With regard to any future conquests that were made the following was resolved: 'Whereas we, the confederated Estates, are obliged to supply this help at our own costs and damages, we hereby decree that of all that shall be conquered with the said help nothing shall be appropriated (excepting only movable goods which come under the head of general booty); but the towns, castles, fortresses, or other fixtures, heavy artillery, and so forth, shall remain in our hands, and shall be equally divided at the close of the war, if it has not been done at once, between the confederate electors, princes, and Estates, according to the funds contributed by each one.' Whereas Lutherans and Calvinists were to be leagued together, it was agreed that 'divergence of opinion in some points of religion' should not be a hindrance to friendly co-operation, and theologians were accordingly to be 'forbidden to say insolent things or to make false charges against the opposite party either in books or from the pulpit, or in any way to give occasion for discontent.'

The League was to last for ten years, and all the members were to bestir themselves actively to procure fresh confederates from among the princes, the Estates, and the imperial nobility; the Count Palatine was to try to win over the electorate of Brandenburg and the

Rhenish circle, Würtemberg the Suabian, and Pfalz-Neuburg the Bavarian circle; and first among the imperial cities Strassburg was to be solicited to join. If the Elector of Saxony and the Estates of the upper and lower Saxon circle wished to join, they were to form a separate circle and to be placed under the leadership of the Elector.[1]

On May 16, on the very day on which this so-called League of Defence had been finally settled, Christian of Anhalt wrote to the Elector of the Palatinate: 'In Bohemia especially affairs are assuming such a dangerous attitude that at any moment something may occur to render the help of this League necessary.'[2] He wanted the confederates to arm at once and make a sudden attack on Bohemia.[3] On June 26 he said in a letter to the Margrave of Ansbach: 'Although by adopting this course we shall be drawing the Turks into the Empire, the management of affairs must nevertheless be finally withdrawn from the Prague councillors and committed to the Empire'—that is to say, to the confederates.[4]

Such was the position in the Empire in the middle of 1608.

[1] Sattler, 6, Beil. pp. 9–17; Spiess, *Archivische Nebenarbeiten*, i. 75–83. See Senkenberg, xx. 539–545; Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 255 ff.; Gindely, *Rudolf*, i. 241–242. 'The chief characteristic of the charter of the League,' says Klopp, i. 50, 'is that in all principal respects it says one thing and means another. The League called itself defensive and was offensive. It professed not to be against the Emperor and the Empire; but it was in reality both the creation and soon also, when it succeeded, the instrument of a foreign king against the Emperor and the Empire. It was going to maintain the public peace, and it was the first to break it. Its object was to protect the dignity and freedom of the Imperial Estates, and it set about, at the expense of other Estates, to augment the power and prestige of its members.'

[2] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, i. 712. [3] Ritter, *Gesch. der Union*, ii. 271.

[4] Ritter, *Briefe und Akten*, ii. 12, note.

The Palatinè revolutionary party had in former years paralysed the course of justice in the Empire by refusing to recognise the jurisdiction of the Aulic Council, and by abolishing the inspectoral visitations of the Imperial Chamber. It had also disputed the validity of the Recesses and of decision by the majority. At the Diet at Ratisbon this same party had refused to ratify the Religious Peace in the form in which it had been re-embodied in the Recess in 1566, for they did not want to be bound any longer by the terms of this treaty, but wished to extort another one, and to shape the Empire on an 'altogether new model which should fit in with their own aims.'[1] By their withdrawal from the Diet, the Palatiners dissolved the constitution of the Empire, and destroyed the last link which up till then had kept together the Estates of different religions. The League which they had concluded at Ahausen was now ready for further proceedings. The evil consequences of the revolutionary measures were aggravated by the fact that the rebels sought support in foreign lands, and the Emperor, who had grown utterly helpless, was not in a position to oppose resistance.

After the dissolution of the Diet and the formation of the Protestant League, the destiny of Germany was left to the arbitrament of the sword, although full ten years of manifold negotiations and attempts at accommodation went by before the outbreak of the great

[1] The ambassadors of the Count Palatine and of Hesse-Cassel—so wrote Caspar Schoppe, who was present at Ratisbon—'are daily heard saying that *oleum* and *opera* were quite lost in the wearisome transactions of the Diet; nothing will do but to cast the Empire in a new mould' (Ungersdorf, p. 129). See above, p. 3, what the Count Palatine John Casimir had said as early as in 1581.

civil war, which was to annihilate all the might, greatness, and prosperity of Germany.

This war of annihilation was preceded by a century-long war of pens, the bitterness and hatefulness of which is unparalleled in the history of any other people.

In proportion as religious faith became chiefly or solely an object of strife, as the times became poorer in creative thought and vigorous personalities, as interest in the affairs of the Fatherland waxed colder and colder, so much the more did literary energy become wild and rampant: in this department the leaders of public opinion persecuted one another 'with ever-increasing fury and acrimony.' 'Anyone who lived at the time,' says a 'simple layman' shortly before the beginning of the Thirty Years' War, 'must verily wonder that we did not long ago come to general bloodshed and massacre, for the way in which the "pen-men," who can be counted by hundreds, slander, curse, and bedevil each other, and stir up the princes, lords, and people, inciting them to rebellion and warfare, is beyond all thinking, and cannot be sufficiently denounced. Nothing is valued any longer of all that our ancestors thought sacred and venerable; all alike is being dragged in the mire, reviled and cursed. The exalted chiefs are attacked and execrated, and those who commit crimes go unpunished; every writer and scribbler thinks he himself alone is right, and his creed the only saving one, and whatever his opponents say is all from the devil, and they will be cast back into the stinking pit of hell from whence they came; they curse and denounce each other as worse and more abominable than the devil and Beelzebub.' The language of reason was no longer in force, but that of

passion which addressed itself to passion. Proof and demonstration were considered quite superfluous. In order to convince the people, it was thought quite sufficient to repeat the same charges again and again, to make daring assertions and to stick to them, supporting them only by isolated examples calculated to appeal to the popular mind.

After the middle of the sixteenth century 'the number of disputants and scribes swelled rapidly to overpowering numbers.'

'Who, indeed,' says the 'simple layman,'[1] 'could count up all the great books and the little books coming from theologians, preachers, jurists, councillors, verse-makers, and what not, in which all the quarrelling and hatred and bedevilment were poured forth; all the histories, sermons, disputations, lampoons, libels, complaints, counter-complaints, rubbishy pamphlets, not to speak of comic verses, caricatures, scurrilous leaflets which were sold at every fair and hawked about by

[1] *An Explanation of the Paternoster, together with wholesome admonitions for every Christian man and woman. Von einem einfältigen Lay zur Ehre Gottes gesetzt* (1617), Bl. 7ᵃ, 13. Stieve, in the first and second volumes of his *Politik Bayerns*, is the first writer who has emphatically drawn attention to the high significance which the polemics of creeds had for the State and the people, and he has also registered or remarked at some length on many books and pamphlets hitherto little noticed. That he has conferred a great service in this way even those will acknowledge who do not agree with all his conclusions. The number of writings in this indilectible field is legion, and it would have been impossible for me in the following pages to deal even with those with which I have a closer acquaintance. My sole endeavour has been to trace somewhat more accurately the influence of the more important specimens. The literature of polemical preaching, in especial, demands far fuller treatment than I am able to give to it. Marx, in the articles cited in his catalogue of books, has contributed good, though by no means exhaustive, matter for the investigation of this subject. See Marx, 'Von der protestantischen Kanzel. Beiträge zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes,' in *Katholik*, 1887, ii. 29–63, 278–300, 500–538 (Mainz, 1887).

pedlars from house to house?' 'Men of insight and understanding,' the 'simple layman' continues, 'distressed at the lamentable abuse of the noble art of printing which God inspired us Germans to invent and perfect, have oftentimes asked whether, in view of all the unspeakable and mischievous results of printing, manifesting themselves daily more and more in distrust, suspicion, envy, hatred, hostility—whether it would not have been better and more salutary for the common people if this art had never been discovered.'

ADDENDA

Page 25, n. 1.

Concerning the pamphlet of Macco, see 'Hist.-polit. Blätter,' 138, p. 715 ff.

Page 90, n. 1.

Concerning the financial conditions in the archbishopric of Cologne during the first years of the reign of the Elector Ernest of Bavaria, 1584–1588, see the Dissertation of J. M. Ruetz (Bonn, 1901).

INDEX OF PLACES

ABDINGKOFEN (abbey), 338
Admont (abbey), 289
Ahausen (Union), 517 ff., 520
Aix-la-Chapelle, 25 f., 28, 29 ff., 62, 90 (*n.* 1), 136, 240, 313
Albania, 187
Alsace, 62, 133 f., 174, 183, 283, 343, 374
Altenburg. *See* Saxe-Altenburg
Altorf in Mid-Franconia, 215
Altorf in Switzerland, 343
Altötting, 313
Amberg, 198, 218
Anhalt (principality), 113
Anhalt-Bernburg (principality), 156, 212, 279, 491. *See* Christian
Anhalt-Dessau (principality), 241
Annaberg, 161 (*n.* 1)
Ansbach (margraviate). *See* Brandenburg-Ansbach
Appenzell, 343
Aquileja (patriarchate), 400 (*n.* 1)
Aragonia, 189 (*n.* 2)
Arnsberg (county), 53
Arnsberg (town), 51, 53
Arnstein, 369
Aschaffenburg, 313, 326, 362, 420 (*n.* 1)
Attendorn, 55
Augsburg (bishopric), 296, 325 (*n.* 1), 371 f., 455
Augsburg (town), 127, 313 f., 316, 323 (*n.* 2), 345, 371 ff.
Augsburg (Confession), 8, 23 ff., 49 f., 55, 67, 75, 80 ff., 104, 112, 114, 137 ff., 143, 148, 151, 169, 176, 192 f., 201, 207, 209, 227, 240, 348, 352 f., 355, 363, 384, 407, 410, 449, 478, 481, 485, 515
Augsburg (Diet, 1555), 64, (1566) 253, 258, 482, 487, 492, 496, 520; (1570) 258; (1582) 3 (*n.* 1), 9, 11, 14–25, 29–41
Augsburg (ecclesiastical reservation), 11, 16, 52, 64, 75, 80, 126, 136, 138, 175 (*n.* 2), 189, 209
Augsburg (Religious Pacification or Peace), 8, 20–25, 30 ff., 44, 48, 52, 64 f., 79, 84 ff., 92, 115, 117, 120, 125, 132, 137 f., 143, 173 f., 178, 192 ff., 207 ff., 227, 250–256, 258, 271, 287, 290, 302, 347, 354, 361, 363 f., 372, 405, 418, 441, 447, 449, 453, 456, 459, 462–487, 492, 520
Austria, 3, 41, 76, 184, 200, 203, 246, 273 ff., 380 (*n.* 1), 395, 398, 425, 442 f., 500 ff., 504 ff., 514; Austria in the narrower sense, Upper and Lower, 41, 234 f., 337 (*n.* 4), 504; Austrian outlying lands, 180; Austrian Dukes, 117 (*n.* 4), 273, 427, 435, 505; Austria (House), 3, 9 (*n.* 2), 11, 37, 41, 60, 69, 128 (*n.* 1), 129 f., 243, 273, 277, 280 f., 404, 429, 443, 499 ff., 507, 512

BADEN-BADEN (margraviate), 319, 357
Baden-Durlach (margraviate), 206, 212, 241, 249, 271, 279, 491, 517
Bamberg (bishopric), 145, 375 ff., 439
Bamberg (town), 314, 375
Basle (university), 164
Bavaria, 15, 40, 46, 58, 60, 71, 83, 101 (*n.* 1), 105, 108, 119, 124, 130, 144 ff., 172, 180, 187 f., 188 (*nn.* 1 and 3), 190, 195, 201, 204, 211, 238 (*n.* 2), 239

(*nn.* 1 and 2), 246, 273, 274 (*n.* 2), 281, 288, 290, 312 (*n.* 2), 320, 334 f., 340, 357, 372, 375, 380 (*n.* 1), 387, 396, 405, 410, 416, 420, 426, 432 f., 435, 439, 452, 454, 467, 469, 483 ff., 497 (*n.* 1), 514
Bavarian Circle, 519
Belgium, 368
Belgrade (Griechisch-Weissenburg), 425
Benediktbeuern (monastery), 335
Bentheim (county), 156
Berg (fortress, Rheinberg), 247
Berg near Donauwörth, 464
Bergen near Magdeburg (Formula of Concord), 1, 102, 114, 137, 149, 151, 160, 225, 230, 233
Berlin (court and town), 112
Bern, 181
Biberach, 346
Biburg, 313, 323 (*n.* 2)
Bilstein (district), 55
Binau, 214
Bissingen (county and lordship), 374
Blijenbeck (library), 16 (*n.* 1)
Bohemia, 40, 76, 129, 187, 200, 246, 380 (*n.* 1), 440 f., 501, 507 ff., 519
Böhmisch-Brod, 509
Boltringen, 261
Bonn, 43, 47, 57, 68, 78, 313
Bozen, 344
Brabant, 35
Brandenburg (margraviate and electorate), 17, 20 f., 63, 81, 83, 89, 92 (*n.* 1), 99, 108, 112, 117, 130–133, 136 f., 148, 181, 188, 198, 203, 212, 241, 253, 260 ff., 271 f., 279, 286, 405, 430 (*n.* 5), 440, 444 ff., 468, 478, 484, 489 ff., 498, 505, 511, 513, 518
Brandenburg-Ansbach (margraviate), 446, 455, 491. *See* Joachim Ernest
Brandenburg - Ansbach - Baireuth (margraviate), 202, 212, 241, 411 (*n.* 1). *See* George Frederic
Brandenburg-Kulmbach (Margraviate), 74, 444, 446, 491, 517
Braunsberg, 324
Bremen (archbishopric), 11 (*n.* 1), 13, 42, 183 (*n.* 1), 483
Bremen (town), 155
Breslau (bishopric), 380 (*n.* 1)
Breslau (town), 311
Bretten (Diet, 1605), 430 (*n.* 5)
Brixen (bishopric), 331, 380 (*n.* 1)
Brixen (town), 344
Bruck, 414
Bruck (Provincial Diet, 1572, and General Provincial Diet, 1578), 383, 385 (*n.* 1); treaty of, 388, 398 (*n.* 3)
Brühl, 43
Brünn, 330
Brunswick (town), 161, 261
Brunswick-Lüneburg (duchy), 165, 202, 206, 241, 490
Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, 36, 136, 148, 202, 206, 245, 264, 279, 286, 351, 359 (*n.* 1), 491
Büderich, 351 (*n.* 1)
Burgundian Circle, 29, 35, 109
Burgundy, 76, 135
Bursfield (congregation), 337

Cambrai (Cammerich, bishopric and town), 36
Canisza. *See* Kanisza
Capua (archbishopric). *See* Gaetano
Carinthia, 41, 74 (*n.* 2), 382, 400, 403 (*n.* 1)
Carlstadt in Franconia, 367
Carniola, 41, 200, 382, 391 (*n.* 1), 403 (*n.* 1)
Cassel, 79, 172, 252, 513
Cham, 220
Christgarten (Carthusians), 250
Cilli, 414
Cleves (duchy). *See* Jülich-Cleves
Coblentz, 45, 313, 326, 330
Coblentz (Convention of Electors, 1585), 116 (*n.* 1), 125; (1603) 419
Coblentz (Diet), 244
Cologne (archbishopric), 6–14, 19, 41–92, 105, 109, 140, 174 ff., 180 (*n.* 1), 184, 208, 238, 276 (*n.* 1), 280, 319, 322, 357, 433, 469, 473 (*n.* 3), 505
Cologne (nunciatura), 304
Cologne (province of the Franciscan Order), 339
Cologne (Provincial Diet, 1583), 46
Cologne (town), 71, 11, 40, 136, 176, 314, 316 (*n.* 1), 319, 325 f., 329, 338 f.

Cologne (university), 7–8
Como (bishopric), 326 (*n.* 1)
Constance (bishopric), 325 (*n.* 1), 337, 380 (*n.* 1)
Constance (town), 314, 329 f., 346, 494
Constantinople, 39 (*n.* 2), 184, 197, 236, 269, 425, 505
Corvey, 359 (*n.* 1)
Czaslau (Diet, 1608), 507

Danube, the, 454
Denmark, 2, 62, 71 (*n.* 1), 108, 111, 128, 182, 242, 277, 279, 282, 428, 440, 513
Dettelbach, 369
Deune, 328
Dillenburg, 51
Dillingen, 314, 316, 320, 322, 324, 332, 335, 374
Dinslaken (Provincial Diet), 356
Dohna, 228
Donauwörth, 446, 447 (*n.* 1), 448 f., 469 f., 477 f., 497 f., 517
Dresden, 2, 112 f., 135, 142, 150, 153, 160, 188, 231, 290, 391 (*n.* 1), 508
Duderstadt, 328
Duisburg, 349

Ebern, 369
Ebersberg, 313
Egypt, 185, 501
Eichsfeld, 130, 314 (*n.* 3), 326
Eichstätt (bishopric), 296
Eichstätt (town), 314
Eilenburg, 152, 158
Einsiedeln (abbey), 337
Eisenerz, 400, 409
Ellwangen (town), 313
Emmerich, 237, 247
England, 59, 78, 110, 141, 185 f., 198, 235 (*n.* 1), 239, 242 f., 278, 282, 428, 433, 487, 514
Enns (river), 391 (*n.* 1)
Ensisheim, 313, 342, 346
Erfurt, 168, 313, 326, 513
Erlau (bishopric), 423
Erlau (fortress), 500
Erlau (town), 198
Essen, 313
Exaeten (Jesuit college), 333 (*n.* 1)

Feldkirch, 343 (*n.* 6)
Frammersbach, 420 (*n.* 1)
Franconia, 6, 22, 334, 340, 362, 367
Frankfort-on-the-Main, 2 (*n.* 2), 62, 67, 83, 86, 94, 148 (*n.* 3), 186, 191 (*n.* 2), 222, 234 (*n.* 1), 291 (*n.* 2), 420 (*n.* 1), 446, 466 (*n.* 1), 468 (*n.* 1), 475 (*n.* 2), 477, 480, 484 (*n.* 2), 489 (*n.* 1), 490, 514 (*n.* 2)
Frankfort-on-the-Main (Assembly of Imperial Deputies, 1590), 141
Frankfort-on-the-Main (Protestant Estates Diet, 1583), 83 ff.; (1598) 241; (1599) 241, 161; (1600) 248
France, 12, 22, 35, 39, 59, 66 ff., 78 f., 87 f., 90 (*n.* 1), 105–117, 129, 131 f., 139 f., 144, 148, 154 f., 180, 182, 185, 195 f., 227, 235 (*n.* 1), 236, 243–248, 272 f., 277 ff., 230 ff., 428 ff., 434 f., 441 f., 487, 489, 503, 508 (*n.* 1), 513
Frauenalb (nunnery), 249
Frauenberg, near Neuhausen, 170
Freiberg in Saxony, 157 (*n.* 2)
Freiburg in Breisgau (university), 342
Freiburg in Switzerland, 313, 332
Freising (bishopric), 58, 325 (*n.* 1)
Freising (town), 58
Friedberg (congress of ambassadors, 1601), 262; (1602), 270
Fulda (bishopric), 6, 245, 370
Fulda (Diet of Electors, 1606), 291 (*n.* 1)
Fulda (town), 131, 314, 324, 370

Gastein, 378
Geneva, 346
Geresheim (bishopric), 10
German Empire. *See* Charles V., Ferdinand I., Rudolf II., Matthias; Ratisbon and Augsburg, Diets; Augsburg, Ecclesiastical Reservation and Religious Pacification; Ahausen, Union; Münster, League; Spires, Imperial Court of Justice; Vienna, Imperial Chamber, and Vienna and Prague, Aulic Council
Gerolzhofen, 369
Gesecke, 42

Gmünd, 313, 374 (*n.* 5)
Gotha, 295
Gran (town), 197, 425
Gran (fortress), 500
Graz, 187, 316, 321, 346, 380 (*n.* 1), 389, 390 (*n.* 2), 397 ff., 414 f., 426
Graz (university), 393
Greich, 400
Griechisch-Weissenburg, Belgrade, 425
Grisons, 342
Guelders (province), 113 (*n.* 3)
Günzburg, 313

Hagenau (bailiwick), 441
Hagenau (town), 29, 313
Halberstadt (bishopric), 125, 136, 483
Hall-in-the-Tyrol, 316, 322, 329, 344
Hambach, 218, 355
Hammelburg, 370
Hanau (town), 222
Hanseatic towns, 108
Hassfurt, 369
Heidelberg (catechism), 156
Heidelberg (disputation), 97
Heidelberg (town and court), 4, 63, 66, 73 (*n.* 2), 92–104, 108, 195, 214, 268, 272, 283, 391 (*n.* 1), 429, 430
Heidelberg (university), 94, 98 f., 224, 310, 394 (*n.* 4)
Heidingsfeld, 369
Heilbronn, 477
Heilbronn (conclave of estates), 189
Heiligenstadt, 314, 330
Heiligkreuz (abbey in Donauwörth), 447, 450, 453, 498
Helmstädt (university), 170
Hensberg, 339
Hersfeld (imperial abbey), 245
Hesse-Cassel, 2, 5, 52 f., 79, 96, 112, 130, 136, 148, 156, 171, 198, 206, 212, 241, 243, 252, 259, 278 f., 286, 310, 351, 430, 442, 444, 478, 489, 491, 505, 520 (*n.* 1)
Hesse-Darmstadt, 93, 212, 234 (*n.* 1), 241, 490
Hesse-Marbourg, 53, 136, 240 f.
Hildesheim (bishopric), 58
Hildesheim (Carthusian monastery), 338
Hildesheim (town), 313
Hirschau, 220
Hirschhorn, 250
Hochheim, 144
Holland (in the narrower sense, province), 5, 35, 246; (in the wider sense, *see* Netherlands)
Holstein, 192, 242, 279; *cf.* Schleswig-Holstein
Hord, 329
Hungary, 40, 129, 187, 195 ff., 200 f., 272, 408, 422, 423 ff., 439, 443, 469, 500 ff.

India (West Indian Seas), 107
Ingelheim, 95 (*n.* 1)
Ingoldstadt (town), 196 (*n.* 5), 316 (*n.* 1), 319, 322, 335
Ingoldstadt (university), 397
Innsbruck, 9, 315 f., 319, 329, 331, 344
Iphofen, 369
Italy, 90 (*n.* 1), 116, 162, 187, 202, 241, 269, 512

Jena (town), 154, 166
Jerusalem (holy sepulchre), 185
Jesingen in Württemberg, 161
Judenburg, 384
Jülich, or Jülich-Cleve-Berg (duchy), 15, 27 f., 47, 62
Jülich (town), 353

Kahla in Thuringia, 160
Kaisersberg in Alsatia, 134
Kaiserswerth, 10, 47
Kalocsa (archbishopric), 423
Kanizsa (fortress), 269, 500
Kaschau, 423
Klagenfurt, 384, 400, 412 (*n.* 2), 414
Königshofen, 369
Königstein (Saxon fortress), 151, 158
Königstein in the archbishopric of Mayence, 420 (*n.* 1)
Kurbrandenburg, &c. *See* Brandenburg &c.

Laibach (bishopric), 391, 413
Laibach (town), 384, 413
Landsberg, 313, 323, (*n.* 2), 374
Landsberg (League), 60, 125, 127, 145, 439
Landshut, 346
Langensalza, 135
Lauenburg. *See* Saxe Lauenburg
Lauingen, 416 (*n.* 1)
Lavant (bishopric). *See* Stobäus
Leipsic (town), 142, 150, 161, 163 (*n.* 3)
Leipsic (university), 164
Liege (bishopric), 27, 29, 35, 60, 68, 90 (*n.* 1)
Liege (Diocesan Synod, 1585), 90 (*n.* 1), 304
Liegnitz, or Liegnitz-Brieg (duchy), 171 (*n.* 1)
Liegnitz (town), 170
Linz (Diet, 1605), 441 (*n.* 1)
Linz-on-the-Rhine, 330
Lippe (county), 359 (*n.* 1), 433 (*n.* 1)
Lohr in Bavaria, 420 (*n.* 1)
Lorraine (duchy), 283, 433, 514
Löwen (town), 321 (*n.* 1), 340 (*n.* 3), 357 (*n.* 2)
Lower Germany (or Nether), 60, 348
Lower Rhine (German), 91; (Dutch), 140 f., 236
Lower Rhenish-Westphalian Circle, 239
Lower Saxon Circle, 519
Lübeck, 339, 493
Lucerne, 313, 322, 331, 341
Lülsdorf, 77, 78 (*n.* 1)
Lüneburg (duchy). *See* Brunswick-Lüneburg

Madrid (court), 127, 186, 196 (*n.* 2), 273
Magdeburg (archbishopric), 17, 18 (*n.* 1), 109, 131, 133, 135, 136, 199, 212, 272, 483
Marbourg in Styria, 390, 414
Mark (county), 239, 349
Mayence (archbishopric), 3, 17 f., 37, 43 (*n.* 2), 60, 65, 66 (*n.* 1), 72 (*n.* 1), 83, 85, 89 (*n.* 4), 90 (*n.* 1), 108, 126, 130, 180 (*n.* 1), 195, 211, 213 (*n.* 2), 245, 287 (*n.* 1), 290, 298 (*n.* 1), 325 ff., 366, 419, 433, 473, 479, 505, 507
Mayence (Carthusian monastery), 338
Mayence (town), 85, 234 (*n.* 1), 314, 326, 418, 463 (*n.* 1)
Mechtern (court of the counts of Neuenar), 11
Mecklenburg, 136, 192, 207
Mecklenburg-Güstrow, 260, 279
Mediterranean Sea, 185
Meissen, 167, 415
Mellrickstadt, 369
Meschede, 56
Metten (monastery), 337
Meuse, the, 35
Metz (bishopric), 36, 181, 442
Metz (town), 36
Miesbach, 313
Minden (bishopric), 125, 483
Mitterndorf in Upper Styria, 389 (*n.* 2)
Molsheim, 313
Montbéliard, 229
Moravia, 198, 246, 425, 501 ff., 508 ff.
Mörs (town), 238
Mosbach, 214
Mühlhausen, 435
Mühlhausen (Protestant Convention of Princes, 1583), 79
Mühlheim-on-the-Ruhr, 78
Munich, 7, 145, 315, 316 (*n.* 1), 319, 323 (*n.* 2), 346, 357, 457, 462, 497 (*n.* 1)
Münnerstadt, 367, 369
Münster (college), 313, 322, 325 (*n.* 1), 358
Münsterland, 239, 358
Murbach (abbey), 335

Nabburg, 219
Netherlands, the, 5–7, 11, 22, 26, 34 ff., 49, 59, 61, 67 ff., 78, 88, 106 f., 140 f., 156, 196, 199, 236–248, 257, 270, 278, 282 f., 334 (*n.* 1), 350, 356, 408, 428, 433, 442, 487, 513
Nordhausen, 168 (*n.* 4), 169 f.
Nördlingen (Diet of Lutheran Estates, 1607), 455
North Sea, 198
Nuremberg, 125, 251, 295, 441, 446, 490, 493, 514

Oberdorf, 261
Oberndorf, 373
Oberursel, 426 (*n.* 1)
Oberwölz, 389
Oder, the, 198
Oppenheim, 94
Osnabrück (bishopric), 262, 483
Ottingen (county), 241, 250 f.
Ottobeuren, 335

Paderborn (bishopric), 13 f., 245, 313, 358, 360
Paderborn (town), 313, 326 (*n.* 3), 358
Palatinate (electoral principality), 1 ff., 12, 19, 60 f., 63, 72 ff., 82, 87 f., 92–107, 110 (*n.* 1), 137 (*n.* 2), 156, 171, 189, 198, 207, 211 (*n.* 3), 213, 217, 218, 236, 241, 246, 249–275, 279–290, 351, 405, 429 ff., 434, 438 f., 465, 468, 473 ff., 484, 490, 503–520
Pfalz (Palatine) Lautern. *See* John Casimir
Pfalz-Neuburg, 205, 207, 241, 286, 430, 461, 519; *cf.* Philip Louis and Wolfgang Wilhelm
Pfalz-Simmern, 220
Pfalz-Veldenz, 3, 87, 207, 491
Pfalz-Zweibrücken, 12, 102, 156, 202, 206, 212, 241, 256, 271, 491
Plauen (Diet of Protestant Princes), 136 f.
Pleissenburg, 160, 166
Poland, 40, 113, 129, 189, 236, 274, 434
Poltringen, 261
Pomerania, 207, 251, 279, 286, 490
Prague (archbishopric), 16, 276 (*n.* 1)
Prague (Provincial Diet, 1608), 510
Prague (town and court), 117, 127 f., 227 (*n.* 2), 243 (*n.* 1), 274 (*n.* 2), 316, 321 (*n.* 1), 324, 330, 346, 404 (*n.* 2), 420, 425 f., 435, 438, 457, 472, 490 f., 504, 509, 511, 519
Pressburg (Imperial Diet, 1608), 502–505
Pressburg (Provincial Diet, 1604), 424
Pruntrut, 316 (*n.* 1)

Quatzenheim, 134 (*n.* 1)

Raab (fortress), 195, 198
Radkersburg in Styria, 390, 414
Rapperswyl, 346
Ratisbon (bishopric), 470
Ratisbon (Diet, 1594), 188 ff., 273, 449; (1597–1598) 200, 203, 215 (*n.* 1), 234 f., 249, 259, 272; (1603) 284 ff., 417, 504; (1608) 465 ff., 502, 504, 508, 511 f., 520
Ratisbon (Election Diet, 1575), 302
Ratisbon (town), 313, 337, 346
Red Sea, 185
Rees on the Lower Rhine, 247
Reichenbach (monastery), 261
Rhine, Rhinelands, 3, 19, 35, 37, 42, 48, 61, 72, 76 (*n.* 1), 87, 90 (*n.* 1), 140, 191, 195, 201, 239, 245 (*n.* 1), 303, 340
Rheinberg (fortress), 238, 247
Rheinfelden, 342
Rhenish Circle, 12, 61 ff., 519
Rhenish Province of the Jesuit Order, 313
Rieneck, 420 (*n.* 1)
Rithmanshausen, 436
Rittberg, 313
Rome (German college), 146, 301, 307, 323, 361, 401, 419
Rome (papal), 6 f., 9, 45 f., 109, 127, 186, 235, 295 f., 322, 352, 377 (*n.* 3), 432
Rosenheim, 346
Rositz (a castle in Moravia), 502
Rostock (university), 209, 225, 394 (*n.* 4)
Rotenburg, 215
Rothenburg on the Tauber (Assembly of the Estates, 1584), 83, 86
Rottenburg on the Neckar, 346
Röttingen, 369
Ruremond, 339

St. Blasius (abbey), 335 f.
St. Gall (abbey and town), 336
St. Veit (Styria), 385
Salzburg (archbishopric), 17, 39, 125, 203, 205, 243 (*n.* 1), 303, 336, 377, 379, 439
Salzburg (college), 336
Salzburg (town), 377

Saxe-Altenburg, 157, 476
Saxe-Lauenburg, 262, 271
Saxe-Weimar, 95, 148, 476
Saxony (electorate), 2, 14, 18 ff., 42, 63, 81, 83, 89 (*n.* 4), 96, 99, 108 f., 112 ff., 130 f., 137, 142, 144, 148–168, 170 f., 188, 192, 195, 199, 201, 226 ff., 241, 245, 251 f., 260, 273 (*n.* 3), 279, 289 ff., 298, 354, 405, 431, 441, 448, 468, 475, 484, 488, 490, 505, 508, 513, 519
Saxony (Ernestine lands), 490
Schaffhausen, 164
Scharfenau, near Cilli, 412
Scheyern (abbey), 335 (*n.* 5)
Schleswig-Holstein, 192, 279
Schlettstadt, 313
Schottwiener (treaty), 276 (*n.* 1)
Schultern (Benedictine monastery), 336
Schwarzach (Benedictine monastery), 336
Schwyz, 343
Scotland, 156, 198, 282, 322
Seckau (bishopric), 17, 380 (*n.* 1), 413
Selz, 99
Sigmaringen, 342
Silesia, 198, 203, 380 (*n.* 1), 503, 507 f., 511
Sinsheim (bishopric), 4, 253
Smalcald (league), 469, 494, 512
Smalcald (town), 367
Smalcald (war), 494
Solms (county), 156
Solothurn, 343
Spain, 26, 40 (*n.* 1), 43, 59, 68 ff., 87, 107 ff., 116, 128, 140, 144, 186, 189 (*n.* 3), 195–202, 235 ff., 270, 275, 277, 404, 428, 432, 434 f., 440, 443, 465, 467
Spires (bishopric), 3, 87, 481
Spires (Imperial Court of Justice or Chamber), 21 ff., 81, 94, 105, 109, 206, 213, 240, 249 ff., 259, 273, 286 ff., 344, 417 ff., 456, 472, 481, 520
Spires (meeting of deputies, 1600), 249; (1601) 263 f., 285, 291 (*n.* 3)
Spires (town), 60, 66, 146, 234 (*n.* 1), 240, 314, 326, 446, 493
Stans, 343
Stavelot, 35
Steinfurt (county), 156
Sterbohol, 511
Stolpen (castle), 159
Strasburg (bishopric), 125, 173–183, 189, 208, 260, 262, 282 f., 325
Strasburg (town), 52, 62, 67, 82 (*n.* 1), 125, 174–183, 240, 250, 394 (*n.* 4), 446, 490, 492 ff., 519
Straubing, 346
Strehlen, 162
Stuhlweissenburg, 346
Styria, 74 (*n.* 2), 269, 303, 320, 344, 380 (*n.* 1), 382 (*n.* 1), 500, 505. *See* Ferdinand
Suabia, 6, 329
Sweden, 71 (*n.* 1)
Switzerland, 39, 52, 90 (*n.* 1), 108, 133, 135, 155, 181 (*n.* 1), 278, 336 f., 347, 408, 432
Switzerland (province of the Capuchins), 343

TARTARS, 189
Tecklenburg (county), 156
Tegernsee (monastery), 335
Terburg on the Alten Yssel, 88
Tyrol, 125, 234 (*n.* 1), 315, 326 (*n.* 3), 340, 344, 380 (*n.* 1), 421, 441 (*n.* 1)
Tyrol (province of the Capuchins), 344
Tirschenreuth, 219
Torgau (Assembly of Protestant Princes, 1591), 142 ff., 148; (1592), 199
Totis, 195
Toul (bishopric), 36, 442
Trent (bishopric), 16, 60, 325 (*n.* 1)
Trent (confession of faith), 303, 375
Trent (Council), 79, 90 (*n.* 1), 115, 240, 296, 299, 302 ff., 308, 334, 337, 481
Trent (town), 321
Treves (archbishopric), 4, 7, 37, 60, 65, 83, 85, 87, 115 f., 180 (*n.* 1), 314, 326, 479
Treves (town), 314, 323 (*n.* 2), 326, 328
Tübingen (town), 374
Tübingen (university), 394 (*n.* 4)
Tückelhausen (Carthusian monastery), 338

Turkey, 3, 14, 19, 32, 35, 39, 41, 86, 107, 121 (*n.* 1), 140, 154, 184–205, 210–212, 221, 234 ff., 239, 243 (*n.* 1), 248, 257, 269 ff., 282, 284, 288, 331 ff., 346 (*n.* 2), 383, 388 f., 402, 404, 417, 425, 428 (*n.* 1), 439, 466 f., 482, 500, 507, 519
Tuscany, 128, 433
Tzokaki (battle), 346

Ulm, 446, 455, 461, 466, 490
Union. *See* Ahausen
Unna in Westphalia, 222
Upper Germany (province of the Order of the Society of Jesus), 294, 313
Upper Palatinate, 103, 218–226
Upper Rhenish Circle, 244, 269
Upper Saxon Circle, 519
Utrecht (province), 35

Venice, 39 (*n.* 2), 185 f., 198, 236, 246, 408, 423
Venice (province of the Capuchins), 343–344
Venloo, 348
Verden (bishopric), 483
Verdun (bishopric), 36, 442
Vervins (peace of, 1598), 235
Vienna (Austrian Secret Treaty), 443
Vienna (interchangeably Prague, Imperial Chamber), 258 ff., 263, 271, 418, 423, 451 ff., 455, 475, 504, 520
Vienna (Provincial Diet, 1608), 504
Vienna (town and court), 16, 116, 187, 198, 269, 303, 321, 324, 330, 346, 404, 425
Vienna (Turkish Peace, 1606), 427 ff., 502, 507
Villach, 400
Volkach, 369
Vorarlberg, 342 f.
Vortlage, 437

Wallis, the, 346
Wedinghausen (monastery), 55
Weimar. *See* Saxe-Weimar
Weingarten (abbey), 336
Weisskirchen, 420 (*n.* 1)
Werl, 56
Wesel, 239, 349
Wesel (Calvinistic Synod), 349
Westphalia, 13, 42, 53–57, 44, 71, 76 (*n.* 1), 82, 88, 90 (*n.* 1), 236, 357
Westphalian Circle, 244 f.
Wetterau (in the Index of Persons)
Wied (county), 156
Wiesensteig (collegiate abbey), 374
Wilten, 329
Wittenberg (Disputation, 1580), 97
Wittenberg (town), 150, 152, 156, 161
Wittenberg (university), 161, 164, 382 (*n.* 1), 394 (*n.* 4)
Wittgenstein (county), 156
Wockelum, 56
Wolfenbüttel (duchy). *See* Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel
Worms (Assembly of Protestant Estates, 1583), 61
Worms (bishopric), 253
Worms (Diet), 452
Worms (meeting of deputies, 1586), 126
Würtemberg, 44, 51, 83, 93, 118 f., 148, 192, 202, 207, 261, 279, 283, 354, 426, 429, 445, 461, 475 (*n.* 1), 513
Würzburg (bishopric), 60, 130, 245, 319, 325, 361 f., 364 ff., 375, 439, 512
Würzburg (Carthusian monastery), 338
Würzburg (town), 316, 319, 326, 330, 361, 369, 416, 420 (*n.* 1)
Würzburg (university), 362

Xanten, 238 (*n.* 1)

Zealand, 5, 35, 246
Zips (district of), 424
Zirgesheim, 464
Zsitva-Torok (peace of, 1606), 427, 502, 507
Zürich, 181, 225
Zweibrücken (county). *See* Pfalz-Zweibrücken
Zweibrücken (town), 51 (*n.* 2)
Zwickau, 152
Zwiefalten (abbey), 335 (*n.* 5)

INDEX OF PERSONS

AFFELMANN, JOH. (Professor at Rostock), 225
Agnes Hedwig of Anhalt (Electress of Saxony), 113 f., 149
Agricola, Kastulus (S.J.), 330
Agricola, George (IV., Bishop of Seckau and Plenipotentiary of the Archbishop of Salzburg), 17, 39
Albert (Archduke, Governor of the Netherlands), 277, 280, 432, 442 f., 506
Albert (Prince of Bavaria), 320
Albert of Brandenburg (Archbishop of Mayence and Magdeburg), 17
Albert V. (Duke of Bavaria), 273 (*n.* 3), 312 (*n.* 2), 316, 372, 387
Albert (Margrave of Brandenburg-Kulmbach), 74
Alençon. *See* Francis
Alexander of Parma (Governor of the Netherlands), 36, 47, 59, 61 f., 140, 141 (*n.* 2)
Aloysius Gonzaga, St., 296 (*n.* 2)
Alt, Salome, 204
Alva, Ferd. Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of (Spanish general and statesman), 26, 349, 350 (*n.* 3)
Amelia of Cleves, 355
Amman, Matthew (Secretary of the Styrian *Landschaft*), 392, 393 (*n.* 1)
Anabaptists, 355, 378 (*n.* 2)
Ancel (French Resident at Prague), 277
Andreä, James (Provost at Tübingen), 97, 101 f., 229, 374
Andreas of Austria (cardinal and legate), 72
Anjou. *See* Francis
Anna of Bentheim-Tecklenburg (Princess of Anhalt), 242
Anna of Denmark (Electress of Saxony), 5, 95, 113
Anna of Austria (Duchess of Bavaria), 58
Antonius (Roman), 94
Aquaviva, Claudius (General of the Jesuits), 304, 347
Aremberg, Charles (Count of), 47, 51
Arena, Cesar Dell', 46 (*n.* 1)
Aschhausen, Joh. Gottfr. von (Bishop of Bamberg), 376
Augustine I. (Abbot of Einsiedeln), 337
Augustine, St. (Father of the Church), 178
Augustus, Emperor, 94

BACKOFEN (Burgomaster at Leipsic), 163
Barbaro, Francis (Patriarch of Aquileja), 400
Baronio, Brocardo, 432
Barvitius (Imperial councillor), 420
Bathori, Christopher (Voyvode of Transylvania), 40
Bathori, Sigmund (Voyvode of Transylvania), 269
Bathori, Stephen (King of Poland), 40
Becan, Martin (Jesuit of Mayence), 463 (*n.* 1)
Bechtold, Winand, 3, 16, 30 (*n.* 1), 33
Belgiojoso, John James (Imperial general), 424
Bemmelberg, Conrad von (Bavarian ambassador), 290

Benedictines, 335
Bentheim, Arnold (Count of), 237 (*n.* 1)
Berg, Fred. (Count of), 238
Berlepsch, Eric Volkmar von (ambassador of the Elector Palatine), 85
Berlepsch, Otto Wilhelm von (Hessian ambassador), 513
Berlichingen, Burkhard von (Imperial councillor), 263
Bernardo, Lor. (Venetian), 186
Bettendorf, Dietrich II. von (Bishop of Worms), 253
Beuterich (Doctor, Councillor of the Elector Palatine), 73, 248
Beza, Theodore, 106, 229
Bicken. *See* John, Adam
Blarer von Wartensee, Gerwig (Abbot of Weingarten), 336
Blattner, Solomon (jurist), 233
Blum, Nich. (preacher at Dohna), 228, 230
Bock, Abraham (councillor of the Elector of Saxony), 5 (*n.* 2)
Bockskay, Stephen (Hungarian magnate), 422–427, 430
Bongars, Jacques (French ambassador), 190, 198 (*n.* 4), 244, 277, 281
Bonomi, John Francis (nuncio at Cologne), 15, 90 (*n.* 1), 116 (*n.* 1), 175, 304
Books (lute-player), 216
Boquin (theologian at Heidelberg), 310
Borgia, Francis St. (General of the Jesuits), 58 (*n.* 3), 297 (*n.* 1), 325
Bouillon, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne Duc de (marshal), 62, 133, 135
Bourbon, Cardinal. *See* Charles
Bourbon (House of), 111
Brahe, Tycho de (astronomer), 276 (*n.* 1)
Brandenstein (Saxon ambassador), 479 (*n.* 1)
Breitschedl, Seb. (collector of clerical revenues at Nabburg), 219
Brendel (Archbishop). *See* Daniel
Brenner, Martin (Bishop of Seckau), 380 (*n.* 1), 413
Breuer, Peter (councillor of the Elector of Mayence), 73 (*n.* 2)
Breuers, William of (Canon at Xanten), 237
Brindisi, Lorenzo of, 409 (*n.* 2)
Brünn, Susannah (Dominican Prioress at Strasburg), 179
Brunnius, Augustine (pastor at Jesingen), 161 (*n.* 1)
Bucer, Martin (Reformer), 96
Buchner, Nicholas (Abbot of Zweifalten), 335 (*n.* 5)
Budowec of Budowa, Wenzel, 503, 509
Burkhard, St., 369 (*n.* 2)
Buwinkhausen, Benj. (Würtemberg ambassador), 429

Calignon, Sofroi de (jurist), 69
Calvin, 153, 219, 229
Calvinists, Calvinism, 3–12, 26, 33, 48 ff., 70, 77 (*n.* 2), 92–104, 107, 116, 126 f., 149–173, 174–183, 188, 190 ff., 207, 209, 218 ff., 240, 263 (*n.* 3), 280, 284, 302 (*n.* 2), 349 f., 376
Camerarius, Ludwig (Palatine councillor and ambassador), 190 (*n.* 1)
Candidus, Pantaleon (Superintendent at Zweibrücken), 51 (*n.* 2)
Canisius, Petrus (S.J.), 58 (*n.* 3), 294 f., 297 (*n.* 1), 304 ff., 316, 321 (*n.* 1), 325 (*n.* 2), 328, 332–339, 347, 350, 371 ff.
Capuchins, 276 (*n.* 1), 340 ff., 380 (*n.* 1), 414 (*n.* 4)
Carlos, Don (Infante of Spain), 70
Carthusians, 338 ff.
Cäsarius of Spires (Capuchin novice at Hall), 344
Castagna (nuncio), 8
Catherine de' Medici (Queen of France), 111
Celestinus, Joh. Friedr. (Professor at Jena), 154
Charles, Borromeo, St., 90 (*n.* 1), 322
Charles the Great (Charlemagne), 26
Charles V. (Emperor), 39, 71, 110, 121 (*n.* 1), 185 ff., 348, 468
Charles of Bourbon (cardinal), 107
Charles of Lorraine (Bishop of Metz and Strasburg, cardinal), 182 f., 189, 282 f.
Charles II. (or III.), Duke of Lorraine, 147, 432–433

Charles (Archduke of Styria), 303, 383 ff., 406
Charles II. (son of the above), 117 (*n.* 4), 320, 401, 411 (*n.* 2)
Charles Frederic (Hereditary Prince of Jülich-Cleves), 349, 352, 354 f.
Cherödy, Joh. (Bishop of Erlau), 423
Christian (Prince of Anhalt-Bernburg), 144, 156, 183, 206, 242 f., 275, 282, 378, 441, 443 ff., 473 (*n.* 3), 489, 491, 498, 501, 503, 513, 517, 519
Christian, Margrave of Brandenburg-Kulmbach, 446
Christian IV. (King of Denmark). *See* Denmark
Christian I. (Elector of Saxony), 131, 133, 135 f., 142, 149, 161 (*n.* 1), 172, 227
Christian II. (Elector of Saxony), 157, 228, 230, 232, 289, 431, 475 f., 478 f., 488, 490, 505, 508 (*n.* 1), 513, 519
Christiani, Andreas (Syndic of the Counts of Wetterau), 191 (*n.* 2)
Chrysostom. *See* John
Chyträus, David (theologian), 208, 390 (*n.* 2)
Cistercians, 335
Clement VII. (Pope), 110
Clement VIII. (Pope), 187, 199 f., 235, 240
Colli, Hippolyt von (Palatine ambassador), 513
Condé, Prince of. *See* Henry.
Contarini, Paolo (Venetian ambassador), 39 (*n.* 2)
Crato, Johann von Krafftheim (house physician), 100, 312
Crell. *See* Krell
Croen, Thomas (Bishop of Laibach), 413
Cronberg (Archbishop). *See* Schweikart
Cullmann (councillor of the Elector Palatine), 260
Cyprian, Ernest Solomon (Vice-President of the Consistory at Gotha), 295

DALBERG, EBERHARD VON, 215
Dalberg (Archbishop). *See* Wolfgang
Daniel (Prophet), 178
Daniel, Brendel (Archbishop of Mayence), 327, 366
Darius (King), 178
Davila, Enrico Caterino (historian), 135
Davison, 5 (*n.* 2)
Delfino, Zacharias (cardinal, nuncio), 298, 302 (*n.* 2)
Dernbach, Balthasar (Abbot of Fulda), 370, 379
Dienheim, Eberhard von (Bishop of Spires), 481
Dietrichstein, Baron Adam von, 380 (*n.* 1)
Digasser, Martin (Minorite), 361
Dinckelmann, Johann and Michael, 56
Dionysius (S.J., nephew of Canisius) 350
Dohna, Burgrave Fabian v. (court marshal), 43 (*n.* 2), 133 ff., 213
Dominicanesses, 178 f.
Dorothea, Susannah, of the Palatinate (Duchess of Saxe-Weimar), 95
Draskowitch, George (Archbishop of Kalocsa), 423
Dudith, Andreas (renegade prelate at Breslau), 311
Duodo, Peter (Venetian ambassador), 235 (*n.* 1), 246
Duplessis-Mornay. *See* Mornay
Dürer, Albert, 165

EBER, MICHAEL, 332
Eberstein (Count of), 249; (Countess of), 261
Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius (Bishop of Würzburg), 60, 319, 361, 362 (*nn.* 1 and 2), 375 ff., 379, 439, 512
Egenolph, A. (jurist), 256 (*n.* 1)
Eggers, Heinrich (canon at Xanten) 340, 350
Egloffstein, v. (historian), 502 (*n.* 1)
Ehem, Christopher (Chancellor of the Elector Palatine), 4, 33
Ehses, Stephen (historian), 90 (*n.* 1)
Einsiedel (Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony), 95
Einsiedel. *See* Louis of Saxony
Eleonore (Archduchess), 321

Elgard, Nich. (preacher), 326
Elizabeth (Queen of England), 62, 69, 78, 89, 107 f., 112, 133, 144, 156 (*n.* 1), 177, 185 f., 243
Elizabeth of Hesse (Electress Palatine), 2
Elizabeth von Kurpfalz (Duchess of Saxe-Gotha), 95
Elizabeth von Kursachsen (Countess Palatine of Pfalz-Lautern), 100
Ellenbog, Nich. (Benedictine), 335
Endemann, Peter (magister at Arnsberg), 54 (*n.* 4), 57 (*n.* 3)
Engel, Philip (ambassador of the Elector Palatine), 11 (*n.* 2)
Erasmus of Rotterdam, 225; Erasmians, 349
Eremita, Daniel (from Belgium), 368
Ernest of Bavaria (Elector of Cologne, Bishop of Liege, Hildesheim, and Münster), 7, 29, 58 f., 61, 71, 76 f., 84, 88 f., 109, 180 (*n.* 1), 194 (*n.* 2), 276 (*n.* 1), 280, 357, 433, 438, 469, 505
Ernest (Archduke), 117, 187, 380 (*n.* 1), 398 (*n.* 3)
Ernest II. (Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg), 202, 241
Ernest (Bishop of Bamberg). *See* Mengersdorf
Ernest Frederic (Margrave of Baden-Durlach), 206, 212, 249, 262, 271, 279, 491
Essex, Robert Devereux (Earl of), 89
Exul Christi, 416 (*n.* 1)

Fend, Erasmus (Bavarian councillor), 71 (*n.* 1)
Ferdinand I. (Emperor), 22, 26, 65, 254 (*n.* 1)
Ferdinand (Archduke of Styria; later King of Bohemia and Roman-German Emperor F. II.), 320, 394, 397, 399, 432 f., 443, 468 ff., 473 (*n.* 1), 476, 483, 485 f., 491, 494, 500, 505
Ferdinand of Bavaria (Coadjutor and later Archbishop of Cologne, Bishop of Liege, Hildesheim, Münster and Paderborn), 58 (*n.* 3), 238 f., 245, 320
Ferdinand I. de' Medici (Grand Duke of Tuscany), 433
Ferdinand (Archduke of Tyrol), 83 f., 125, 147, 180, 234 (*n.* 1), 263 (*n.* 3), 276 (*n.* 1), 277, 344 ff., 385
Fichtmann (preacher), 399
Fidelis von Sigmaringen, St. (Dr. Markus Roy), 341
Fischer, J. (historian), 276 (*n.* 1), 441 (*n.* 1)
Fontanus, Joh. (Dutch preacher), 49
Forgach, Count Francis (I., Archbishop of Gran), 428
Forner, Friedr. (Vicar-General and Bishop Auxiliary of Bamberg), 377
Forstenhauser, Otto (Bavarian councillor and ambassador at Prague), 246, 420
Francis (Duke of Alençon and Anjou), 35–41, 52, 90 (*n.* 1), 105
Francis II. (Duke of Sachsen-Lauenburg), 183, 206, 261 f., 271
Franck, Sebastian, 102
Frangipanni, Ottavio Mirto (nuncio), 58, 90 (*n.* 1)
Frederic I. (Emperor), 210
Frederic II. (King of Denmark), 2, 62, 71 (*n.* 1), 108, 111, 128
Frederic III. (Elector Palatine), 3, 50, 87, 95, 100 f., 113 (*n.* 3), 218, 253
Frederic IV. (Elector Palatine), 93 ff., 189, 198, 202, 206 ff., 213, 236, 240, 246, 256 (*n.* 1), 263–275, 282, 287 f., 430, 433, 440, 445 f., 473 ff., 503–508, 512, 517 ff.
Frederic IV. (Duke of Liegnitz), 171 (*n.* 1)
Frederic (Duke of Sachsen-Lauenburg, Chorepiscopus of Cologne, canon at Strasburg), 46, 52, 63, 175 (*n.* 2)
Frederic I. (Duke of Würtemberg), 192, 202, 207, 261, 283, 429, 433, 445, 513
Frederic, William (Duke of Sachsen-Altenburg, administrator of the Saxon Electorate), 157–167, 171, 188, 192, 195, 199–201, 212, 226, 241, 245, 252, 260, 266

Freher, Paul (physician at Nuremberg), 295
Friedemann, Karl (Papal Privy Chamberlain), 196 (*n.* 5)
Friedemann, Viktorin (jurist), 2
Fröschel, Hieronymus (Chancellor at Ansbach), 449
Fuchs (Mayence Chancellor), 479 (*n.* 1)
Fugger (family at Augsburg), 127
Fugger (Markus), 413
Fugger von Kirchberg, James (Bishop of Constance), 380 (*n.* 1)
Fürst (journeyman furrier at Leipsic), 165
Fürstenberg, Caspar von (ambassador of the Elector of Cologne), 141 f.
Fürstenberg, Theodore of (Bishop of Paderborn), 313, 332, 360

Gabelkofer, Hans Ädam (Styrian Provincial Secretary), 404 (*n.* 2)
Gaetano, Ant. (cardinal, Archbishop of Capua, nuncio at Prague), 472
Gailkircher (councillor), 211
Garth (superintendent at Freiberg), 157 (*n.* 2)
Gebhard Truchsess von Waldburg (Archbishop of Cologne), 6–14, 16 (*n.* 1), 19 (*n.* 2), 41, 42–92, 140, 175, 175 (*n.* 1), 177, 183 (*n.* 1), 208, 358
Gebhard, Christopher (S.J.), 330
Gebsattel, Joh. Phil. v. (Bishop of Bamberg), 375, 377, 439
Geizkofler, Zacharias (Imperial Treasurer), 187, 234, 256 (*n.* 1)
Gennep, Ludwig von (doctor), 340, 343, 368, 373 (*n.* 6)
George, Frederic (Margrave of Baden-Durlach), 517
George, Frederic (Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach), 93, 95, 136, 198, 202, 206, 242, 245, 248, 232, 271 f., 282
George, Gustavus (Count Palatine of Veldenz), 3, 87
George, Hans (Count Palatine of Veldenz), 3, 87
Gera, Wilhelm von (delegate to the Provincial Diet), 393
Gerard, Winheim (Carthusian at Würzburg), 338
Geräus, Conrad (superintendent at Oppenheim), 94
Gerstmann, Martin v. (Bishop of Breslau), 380 (*n.* 1)
Gobelinus, Kandius (Carthusian prior at Mayence), 338
Gödelmann (doctor, agent), 263 (*n.* 3)
Gonzaga. *See* Aloysius
Götz, W. (historian), 387
Gracht (Canon). *See* Metternich
Gregory XIII. (Pope), 6 f., 9, 15, 44, 57, 60, 66, 68, 75, 79, 184, 209 f., 298 f., 305 (*n.* 1), 324, 351, 371 ff., 386
Groesbeek, Gerhard of (Bishop of Liege), 27
Gropper, Caspar (nuncio at Cologne), 303, 351, 355
Grumbach, 130
Grynäus, John James (theologian at Basle), 97 f., 164
Guarinoni, Hippol. (physician), 321 (*n.* 1), 344
Guise (family of), 106, 129
Guise (Cardinal). *See* Charles
Guise (Dukes of Lorraine). *See* Charles
Gundermann, Christopher (professor and superintendent at Leipsic), 150, 160 (*n.* 1), 231

Haber, Karl, 359 (*n.* 1)
Hablizel, Joh. (Abbot of Weingarten), 336
Hage, Joh. (Franciscan provincial), 340
Hagemann, Christopher (Ecclesiastical councillor at Mayence), 298 (*n.* 1)
Hannewaldt, Andr. (secretary), 469 (*n.* 1), 506
Harder, Wolfgang (superintendent at Leipsic), 150
Hasenmüller, Elias (controversialist), 435 (*n.* 5)
Haslang (Bavarian general), 462
Hattstein, Marquard von (Bishop of Spires), 3
Hatzfeld, Hermann v. (bailiff), 56

Hausen, Wolfgang von (II. Bishop of Ratisbon), 471
Heisinger (Styrian preacher), 412
Helbach, Albrecht v. (chaplain at the court of the Lutheran Count Palatine of Simmern), 220
Helfenstein, Countess Maria of (*née* Countess of Hohenzollern), 374
Helfenstein, Schweikart and Ulrich (Counts of), 374
Henry (Bishop of Augsburg). *See* Knöringen
Henry I. (Prince of Condé), 12, 88, 111
Henry III. (King of France), 35, 39, 106 f., 111 f., 131, 135
Henry of Navarre (later King Henry IV. of France), 41, 68, 71 (*n.* 1), 88 f., 106 f., 111 f., 129, 131 ff., 140, 143, 155 f., 182, 185, 196, 198 f., 236, 248, 277 ff., 429, 433, 442 ff., 489, 513
Henry of Sachsen-Lauenburg (Archbishop of Bremen, Bishop of Paderborn and Osnabrück), 11–14, 42, 183 (*n.* 1), 358, 360
Henry, Julius (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 136, 148, 202, 206, 241, 245, 248, 259 ff., 264, 271, 271 (*n.* 2), 279, 286
Heresbach, Conrad (tutor to the Jülich Princes), 351 (*n.* 2)
Hess, Peter (an official at the Prince-Electoral court), 51 (*n.* 2)
Hirsch (Styrian provincial secretary), 290 (*n.* 3)
Hirschbeck, Joh. Chrys. (Abbot of Scheyern), 335 (*n.* 5)
Hirschhorn (knights of), 250
Hirschl (historian), 274 (*n.* 2)
Hoffäus, Paul (Jesuit provincial), 294
Hoffmann, Hans Friedr. von, 390 (*n.* 3)
Hofkirchen, Wolfgang Baron of, (Nether-Austrian Government councillor), 408
Hohenembs, Mark Sittich (Count of, Archbishop of Salzburg), 336, 378 f., 414 (*n.* 4)
Hohenzollern, Maria Countess of (Countess of Helfenstein), 374
Homberger (Styrian preacher), 390 (*n.* 3)
Homonnay, Valentin (magnate), 424
Hoserlein. *See* Osiander
Hosius, Stanislaus (cardinal), 298
Huber, Samuel (theologian at Wittenberg), 164 f.
Huber, Wolfgang, 411 (*n.* 2)
Huguenots, 106, 108, 131, 133
Huguerye, Michael de la (a councillor of John Casimir), 12 (*n.* 2), 49, 61, 171
Hundhausen, Karl (doctor at Frankfort-on-the-Main), 2, 148 (*n.* 3)
Hutten, 130
Hutter, Leonard (theologian at Wittenberg), 150

Illéshazy, Stephen (magnate), 500, 505

Jacobe of Baden-Baden (Duchess of Jülich-Cleves), 357
James I. (King of England), 442
Jeslerus, John (theologian at Schaffhausen), 164
Jesuits, 9, 13, 20, 58, 75, 77, 90 (*n.* 1), 108, 113, 118 ff., 130, 168, 171, 237, 239, 273 (*n.* 3), 276 (*n.* 1), 294 f., 301, 304 ff., 339, 341, 347–352, 357–363, 370–379, 393, 393 (*n.* 3), 396 f., 404, 408, 413–416, 419, 423, 431, 433 ff., 437, 463 ff., 476, 478 f., 512, 514 ff., 516 (*n.* 2)
Jews, 168, 186
Joachim II., Ernest (Prince of Anhalt), 114 f., 149
Joachim, Ernest (Margrave of Brandenburg), 444 ff., 513, 517
Joachim, Friedrich (administrator of Magdeburg, then Elector of Brandenburg), 17, 131, 136, 199, 212, 241, 249, 260, 262, 263, 271 f., 279, 286, 430 (*n.* 5), 431, 444 ff., 478, 489, 491, 505, 511, 513
Johann of Münster. *See* Münster
John III. (King of Sweden), 71 (*n.* 1)
John I. (Count Palatine of Zweibrücken), 12, 67, 102 f., 156, 202, 206, 213, 241, 256, 262, 271
John, Adam, of Bicken (Archbishop of Mayence), 419

John, Adolphus (Duke of Schleswig-Holstein), 192, 279
John Casimir (Count Palatine of Pfalz-Lautern, administrator of the Palatine Electorate), 2 ff., 12, 33, 38, 40 f., 48 ff., 61 ff., 66 ff., 71 ff., 82 f., 87, 93–108, 111 f., 126, 128–133, 136, 148, 151, 156, 171 f., 188, 218, 284, 520 (*n.* 1)
John, Frederic II. (Duke of Saxe-Gotha), 95
John, Frederick (Duke of Würtemberg), 513, 515
John George (Elector of Brandenberg), 17, 63, 81, 83, 89 (*n.* 4), 92 (*n.* 1), 99, 112, 117, 133, 136 f., 148, 181, 188, 198 f., 203
John George (Margrave of Brandenburg-Jägerndorf, Governor of the Mark, administrator of Strasburg), 181 ff., 188 f., 282
John George I. (Duke, later Elector of Saxony), 440
John Gottfried (Bishop of Bamberg). *See* Aschhausen
John Philip (Bishop of Bamberg). *See* Gebsattel
John Schweikart of Cronberg (Archbishop of Mayence), 419, 420 (*n.* 1), 433, 439, 473, 479 (*n.* 1), 505, 507
John William (Duke of Jülich-Cleves), 348, 356
John Chrysostom (Capuchin). *See* Schenk von Castell
Julius (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 36, 351
Julius (Bishop of Würzburg). *See* Echter
Jungen, Hieron. zum (ambassador from Frankfort-on-the-Main), 291 (*n.* 2)
Justinian (Emperor), 151

KADNER (historian), 362 (*n.* 2)
Kalkbrenner, Gerh. (Carthusian prior), 339
Kandelberger, Hans George (Austrian agent), 404 (*n.* 2)
Kemnitius, Martin Chemnitz (theologian), 123, 323
Kestlarn, Caspar Melch. v. (S.J.), 331
Khevenhiller, Francis Christopher, 274, 382 (*n.* 1), 408
Khuenberg, George v. (Archbishop of Salzburg), 125, 127, 377
Kinsky, Wenzel (Count of), 503
Kleindienst, Barth. (O. Pr., of Annaberg), 334 (*n.* 1)
Kleinsorgen, Gerh. (councillor of the Elector of Cologne), 13 (*n.* 1), 54–57
Klesl, Melchior (Bishop of Wiener Neustadt, then at the same time Archbishop of Vienna, Minister), 277, 380 (*n.* 1), 425, 443
Knöringen, Henry of (V. Bishop of Augsburg), 372, 448, 455 f.
Knöringen, Johann Egolf v. (Bishop of Augsburg), 325 (*n.* 1)
Kolbinger (secretary to the Elector Palatine), 213
Koster, Francis (S.J.), 318
Krell, Nich. (Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony), 131, 136, 142, 144, 148–161, 226 f., 229 ff.
Kreuzheim, Leonard (Superintendent at Liegnitz), 170
Kuen-Belasy, John James v. (Archbishop of Salzburg), 17, 39, 125, 303
Kunz, Othmar (Abbot of St. Gall), 336

LACKNER, JAMES, 225
Landsberger, Joh. Justus (Carthusian at Cologne), 338
Landschad (Knight of), 214
Lang, Phil. (Imperial valet), 421, 427
Lauber, Heinr. (preacher), 330
Leicester, Robert Dudley (Earl of), 114
Leiser, Polycarp (Lutheran controversialist), 161
Leporinus, Melchior (preacher at Brunswick), 435 (*n.* 5)
Leuchtenberg (Landgrave of), 476
Leutter, Thomas (governor of the castle at Stolberg), 159
Lippe (Count of), 433 (*n.* 1)
Lipsius, Justus (philologist), 321 (*n.* 1)
Loer, Theodoric (Carthusian prior at Hildesheim), 338

Löfenius, Mich. (court jurist to the Count Palatine), 270, 430, 434, 440
Loserth (historian), 382 (*n.* 1), 412 (*n.* 2)
Lossen (historian), 76 (*n.* 1)
Louis II. (King of Bavaria), 274 (*n.* 1)
Louis V. (Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt), 93 ff., 212, 241
Louis III. (the elder, Landgrave of Hesse-Marburg), 52, 212, 241
Louis of Nassau. *See* Nassau
Louis VI. (Palatine Elector), 4, 61, 63, 66, 46, 79, 93 ff., 105
Louis of Saxony (Father Louis of Einsiedel [Capuchin]), 343
Louis III. (Duke of Würtemberg), 44, 50, 83 f., 93, 118 f., 148
Louisa Juliana of Nassau (Electress of the Palatine), 188, 213
Lucas, Braunold (Carthusian), 338
Luther, Lutheran, 121 (*n.* 1), 150 ff., 158 f., 168–171, 179, 223–226, 230, 232

Machowsky, Hieron. (Imperial valet), 421
Madruzzi, Karl Gaudentius (cardinal, Prince-Bishop of Trent), 473
Madruzzi, Louis (cardinal-legate, Prince-Bishop of Trent), 9, 16, 60, 115, 188
Magnus (Duke of Saxe-Lauenburg), 183 (*n.* 1)
Mainardi, Alex. (Imperial court chaplain), 421
Major, Joh. (professor), 150, 164
Manderscheid-Blankenheim, Joh., Count of (fourth Bishop of Strasburg), 174–181
Mangold, Frederic (ambassador of the Elector of Mayence), 195 (*n.* 3)
Manhart, Joh., 426
Mansfeld (Counts of), 10, 290
Mansfeld (Countess of), 10, 12, 51, 55, 78 (*n.* 2), 89, 183 (*n.* 1)
Marbach, Joh. (superintendent at Strasburg), 97
Margaret of Austria (later Queen of Spain), 404
Maria of Bavaria (Archduchess of Styria), 76, 195 (*n.* 2), 198, 276 (*n.* 1), 396, 399, 405, 484, 487, 500, 504
Maria of Austria (Duchess of Jülich-Cleves), 349
Maria of Spain (Empress-widow), 273
Maria Christina of Styria (Princess of Transylvania), 321 (*n.* 1)
Marquard II. v. Bergo (Bishop of Augsburg), 448
Marquard v. Hattstein (Bishop of Spires), *See* Hattstein
Martin, Gerstmann (Bishop of Breslau). *See* Gerstmann
Mary Stuart (Queen of Scotland), 322
Matthias (Archduke, later Emperor), 203, 209, 263 (*n.* 3), 276–281, 285, 288, 332 (*n.* 2), 361, 417 f., 427 f., 441 (*n.* 1), 486, 489
Maurer, Lukas (Germaniker), 328
Maurice. *See* Moritz
Maximilian II. (Emperor), 35, 258 (*n.* 3), 349, 383, 395
Maximilian (Duke of Bavaria), 204, 211, 238, 240, 246, 273 (*n.* 3), 281, 288, 319, 375, 397 f., 410, 420, 426, 432, 439, 452, 455, 458, 461–464, 467, 469, 514
Maximilian (Archduke, grandmaster of the Teutonic Order, Governor of Tyrol and the outlying provinces of Austria), 234 (*n.* 1), 263 (*n.* 3), 273, 274 (*n.* 2), 344 (*n.* 2), 398 (*n.* 3), 441 ff., 507
Maximilian, Ernest (Archduke), 443
Medek, Martin (Archbishop of Prague), 16
Mehemet III. (Sultan), 198, 236
Meister, Al. (historian), 174 (*n.* 1)
Meister, Martin (Abbot of St Blasius), 336
Melber, Ulrich (preacher), 55
Mendoza, Francis of (general), 238 ff., 244, 332
Mengersdorf, Ernest v. (Bishop of Bamberg), 145
Merkbach (Brandenburg chancellor), 263 (*n.* 3)

Metternich, Adolf Wolf von Gracht, (styled canon at Spires), 145 f., 190, 240, 419
Meyer, Wilh. (S.J. at Ingolstadt), 196 (*n.* 5)
Milensio, Fra Felice (Augustinian), 472 (*n.* 2), 486 (*n.* 1)
Miller, George (Mylius, preacher at Augsburg, later professor at Jena), 151 (*n.* 1), 190, 196
Minucci, Minutio, 45, 73 (*n.* 3), 307 (*n.* 1)
Mirus, Martin (court preacher at Dresden), 151 f., 158, 167
Modestinus, Joh. (magister), 154
Moritz (Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel), 196–201, 206, 212, 241–248, 252, 259, 278 ff., 430, 441 f., 478, 489, 505, 520 (*n.* 1)
Moritz (Elector of Saxony), 132
Mornay, Phil. de (Seigneur Duplessis-Marly, statesman; pseudonym, Stephanus Junius Brutus), 41 (*n.* 4), 71 (*n.* 1), 112 (*n.* 1), 133 (*n.* 2), 189, 195, 236 (*n.* 2)
Morone, Joh. (cardinal), 298
Morosini, Gianfrancesco (Venetian ambassador), 184
Moser, Friedr. Karl v. (jurist), 52
Mothäus, Caspar (superintendent), 56
Müller, Bernard (Abbot of St. Gall), 337
Müller, Caspar (Abbot of St. Blasius), 336
Müller, George (theologian), 166
Müller, J. (historian), 234 (*n.* 1)
Münster, Johann v. (Maximilian Philos, of Treves), 437
Murad III. (Sultan), 187
Mylius. *See* Miller

Nablas (Abbot of Metten), 337
Nassau (house of), 5
Nassau, Albrecht (Count of), 43
Nassau, John I. (Count of), 1, 4 f., 6, 11, 19 (*n.* 2), 34, 40 (*n.* 1), 43 (*n.* 1), 49, 53, 67, 82
Nassau, Louis (Count of), 6
Neuberger (assistant to the pastor at Donauwörth), 449
Neuenar (Count of), 140
Neuenar, Adolf (Count of), 11, 51
Neuenar, Hermann (Count of, hereditary steward of the Elector of Cologne), 7, 355
Nicolai, Philip (preacher at Unna in Westphalia), 222
Nidanus. *See* Pistorius
Niedeggen. *See* Schenk
Nigrinus, Georgius (Hessian superintendent), 123, 310
Ninguarda, Felician (Dominican), 304 (*n.* 1), 334, 386

Oldenbarneveldt, Jan van (statesman), 235 (*n.* 1)
Opfer, Joachim (Abbot of St. Gall), 336
Orange, Maurice (Prince of), 156, 241, 441
Orange, William I. (Count of), Nassau-Dillenburg), 1, 5 f., 35, 40, 67, 82, 88, 113 (*n.* 3), 188, 340
Osiander, Lucas (Würtemberg court preacher), 101 (*n.* 1), 119, 121, 391
Othmar (Abbot of St. Gall). *See* Kunz
Ottingen (Counts of), 241, 250, 362
Otto Truchsess (cardinal). *See* Truchsess

Pandocheus, Joh. (pastor at Nordhausen), 169
Pappus, Joh. (preacher and professor at Strasburg), 102, 178
Pareus, David (professor at Heidelberg), 101
Paul III. (Pope), 110
Paul V. (Pope), 432, 464, 467, 472
Pelargus, Ambrosius (Dominican), 334 (*n.* 1)
Perneder, Bernard, 298 (*n.* 1)
Peters, Wilh. (physician from Emmerich), 350, 351 (*n.* 3), 355 (*n.* 1
Petz (Imperial messenger in Constantinople), 185
Peucer, Caspar, 100, 114
Philip (Prince of Bavaria), 320
Philip (Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg-Grubenhagen), 165
Philip II. (King of Spain), 40 (*n.* 1), 69 f., 107 ff., 117, 128 f., 186, 195 f., 199, 236, 243 f., 275, 277, 473 (*n.* 3)

Philip III. (King of Spain), 404, 428, 432, 435, 440, 443, 465
Philip, Louis (Count Palatine of Neuburg), 50, 192, 205, 241, 284, 455, 478, 490, 511, 517
Philip Sigismund (Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg), Bishop of Osnabrück), 262
Philos v. Treves, Maximilian. *See* Münster, Johann v.
Pierius, Urban (superintendent-general and professor at Wittenberg), 150, 152, 161, 231
Pistorius, Joh. (Pfisterhaus, house physician at the Bavarian court), 144
Plessen (ambassador of the Count Palatine), 468, 473 (*n.* 3), 505
Plettenberg, Gertrude v., 90 (*n.* 1)
Pollius, Joh. (preacher), 350
Pontanus. *See* Spanmiller
Popp, Hans (Imperial valet), 273 (*n.* 3), 421
Portia, Barth., Count of (Nuncio at Munich), 7, 304, 319
Portia, Hieron. v. (Nuncio at Prague), 426, 432
Possevin, Anton (S.J.), 332
Præmonstratensian monks, 335; nuns, 339
Pruckmann (ambassador), 469 (*n.* 1), 514

Rabenstein, James (S.J.), 374
Rader (pastor at Löwen), 357 (*n.* 2)
Raittenau, Wolf Dietrich v. (Archbishop of Salzburg), 204 f., 243 (*n.* 1), 377 ff., 439
Recke, von der (bastard), 56
Reckschenskel, Joh. (Carthusian prior at Cologne), 140 (*n.* 2)
Reineck (theologian at Heidelberg), 224
Reinhold, Joachim (Weimar councillor), 148
Rem, James (S.J., at Ingolstadt), 319
Reuber, Justus (jurist), 94
Rickard (Count Palatine of Simmern), 220
Rickel, Dionys. (Carthusian), 338
Rieger, Joh. (preacher at Nordheim), 170
Rosenberg, Peter Wock v., 503
Röslin, Helisäus (physician), 74 (*n.* 2)
Rosolenz, James (provost at Mayence), 382 (*n.* 1)
Roth (Pfalz-Neuburg councillor), 461
Roy, Markus. *See* Fidelis
Ruben, Leonard (Abbot of Abdingkofen), 337
Rudolf II. (Emperor) 7 f., 17–40, 47, 52, 58, 61, 63, 71 (*n.* 1), 74 ff., 80, 83, 85 f., 94, 105, 108 f., 116 (*n.* 1), 117, 126, 134, 137 ff., 146 ff., 155, 173–177, 180 f., 184, 192, 194, 197 (*n.* 1), 207 f., 227, 227 (*n.* 2), 234, 240 ff., 248, 257, 259 f., 262 f., 265, 267, 270, 272, 273 (*n.* 3), 284 ff., 301 f., 380 (*n.* 1), 408, 412, 416, 431 f., 438 ff., 443, 452–461, 463 f., 467, 472, 479, 485, 487, 493, 514, 520

Sacramentarians, 169, 226, 355
Salentin von Isenburg (Archbishop of Cologne), 6, 48
Salm, Julius (Count of), Imperial councillor), 34
Salm, Caspar, 102
Salmuth (court preacher at Dresden), 150, 160, 231
San Clemente, Don Guillen de (Spanish ambassador), 194 (*n.* 2), 196 (*n.* 3)
Saurau, Ehrenreich (Styrian land marshal), 408
Saxony (house of, Ernestine line), 490
Sayn-Wittgenstein, Louis Count of (ambassador of the Count Palatine), 488 f., 498
Schacher, Caspar (syndicus of Frankfort - on - the - Main), 468 (*n.* 1)
Scharp, Hans Christian v., 197 (*n.* 1)
Schauenburg, Martin v. (Bishop of Eichstätt), 296
Schenk (goldsmith at Donauwörth), 454
Schenk von Castell, Joh. Chrys. (Capuchin), 342
Schenk von Medeggen (general), 140
Scherer, George (S.J., in Vienna), 119 f., 121 (*n.* 1), 363, 379 f.

Schilter, Zach. (vice-chancellor of the Saxon Elector), 114
Schirmer, James (preacher at Nordhausen), 168 (*n.* 4)
Schoppe, Caspar (Ungersdorff, convert), 266 (*n.* 1), 520 (*n.* 1)
Schopper, James (professor), 98
Schrauz, Wolfgang (Styrian vice-chancellor), 385
Schug, Leonard (councillor of the Count Palatine), 215, 252, 267
Schuster (Bishop of Seckau), 380 (*n.* 1), 412
Schütz (court preacher at Dresden), 162
Schweikart. *See* Johann
Schweinichen, Hans v., 214
Sedelius, Wolfgang (Benedictine), 335
Ségur - Pardeillan, Jacques de (French ambassador), 69, 71 (*n.* 1), 107, 111, 117
Selnekker, Nich. (superintendent), 114, 153 (*n.* 4), 228
Senkenberg, Renatus Karl, Baron of (historian), 254 (*n.* 1)
Sepp, Hans (from Ulm), 466
Sieber (first burgomaster at Leipsic), 165
Sinan (grand vizier), 186 f., 195
Sittich. *See* Hohenembs
Sixtus V. (Pope), 107 f., 115, 116 (*n.* 1), 134, 184, 371
Solms (Count Hermann Adolf v.), 12 (*n.* 1), 19 (*n.* 2), 175
Somnius (professor), 98
Sophia of Kurbrandenburg (Electress of Saxony), 156, 232
Spangenberg, Cyriacus, 311, 365
Spanmiller, James (S.J., called Pontanus), rector at Augsburg, 321 (*n.* 1), 373
Spaur, Christopher Andrew (Bishop of Brixen), 331, 380 (*n.* 1)
Speciano, Madruz, 194 (*n.* 2)
Stainhauser, James (secretary to the Archbishop of Salzburg), 378
Starhemberg, Gottfried v., 501, 511
Starhemberg, Louis v., 505
Starhemberg, Richard v., 501, 505, 511
Steinbach, Dav. (court preacher at Dresden), 150, 152, 159 f., 231
Steinegg, Martin (Benedictine, professor at Salzburg), 336
Stitz, James (S.J.), 329
Stobäus, von Palmburg, George (Bishop of Lavant), 312 (*n.* 2), 385 (*n.* 1), 387, 401, 403 (*n.* 1), 412 (*n.* 2)
Stör, Rudolf (Abbot of Murbach), 335 (*n.* 5)
Strack, Joh. (preacher at Cassel), 172
Stralen, Anton v. (Franciscan provincial), 340
Stralendorff, Leopold v. (Imperial vice-chancellor), 491
Strigenitius, Gregorius (superintendent at Meissen), 415
Sully, Max de Bethune, Baron de Rosny, Duc de (French minister), 429
Surius, Laurentius (Carthusian at Cologne), 312 (*n.* 2), 339

Tanner, Conrad (bailiff at Appenzell), 343
Tanner, Philip (Capuchin), 343
Tautscher, Joh. (Bishop of Laibach), 391
Teuder, Caspar (preacher at Erfurt), 169
Teutonic Order, 477
Thüngen, Neidhard v. (Bishop of Bamberg), 375
Thurn, Hans Ambrose (Count of), 426
Thurn, Hein. Matthias (Count of), 503
Thurzo (magnates), 500; Nicholas and Stanislaus, 511
Tossanus, Daniel (professor), 97
Trefler, Florian (Benedictine), 335
Trennbach, Urban v. (Bishop of Passau), 379
Truchsess von Waldburg, Gebhard (Archbishop). *See* Gebhard
Truchsess von Waldburg, Karl, 57, 83
Truchsess von Waldburg, Otto (Bishop of Augsburg, cardinal), 298 ff., 304, 365, 373, 448
Tschernembl, George Erasmus (Baron of), 502 (*n.* 1), 507

Ubiquists, 365
Ulrich (Duke of Mecklenburg-Güstrow), 136, 192, 207, 260, 279

Ungersdorff, Christopher v. *See* Schoppe
Unverzagt, 276 (*n.* 1)
Urban (Bishop of Passau). *See* Trennbach
Urbani (Tuscan messenger), 128
Ursinus, Calvinist, 11
Utzinger, Alexander (preacher in Smalcald), 367

Valois (house of), 106
Vanmeegen, Reinhold (licentiate at Löwen), 340 (*n.* 3)
Vespermann, Henry (ambassador of the Elector of Mayence), 213 (*n.* 2), 215 (*n.* 1), 218 (*n.* 2)
Vest, Joh. (Imperial financier), 186 (*n.* 4)
Viehäuser (Imperial vice-chancellor), 127
Viger, Nich. (Franciscan provincial at Cologne), 340
Villeroy, Nich. (II. de Neufville, Seigneur de, French Secretary of State), 235 (*n.* 1), 278 ff.
Volk (S.J., in Augsburg), 316
Vossens, Jost (an official of the Elector of Mayence), 108, 110 (*n.* 1), 126 (*n.* 1)

Waldburg. *See* Truchsess
Waldburg, Christoph. v., 431
Waldstein (Wallenstein), Albrecht v., 502
Weiland (pastor at Donauwörth), 448
Weilhammer, Christoph. (Germaniker), 327
Weinhausen (Calvinist at Leipsic), 164
Weinhold (pastor at Aschaffenburg), 362
Weinreich (Germaniker), 328
Weinsberg, Hermann, 9
Weller, Gerhard (S.J.), 366
Wetterau (Counts of), 7, 191 (*n.* 2), 206, 241, 279, 429
Wiederholdt, Clement (official of the Elector of Mayence), 287 (*n.* 1), 290 (*n.* 2)
Wigand (theologian), 168
William V. (Duke of Bavaria), 15, 46, 58 (*n.* 2), 60, 73, 76, 83, 101 (*n.* 1), 105, 108, 119, 124 f., 130, 144–147, 172, 180. 187, 190, 195, 205, 238, 273, 312 (*n.* 2), 320, 335, 372, 375, 396 ff.
William IV. (Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel), 2, 5, 52 f., 79, 96, 112, 130, 136, 148, 156 f., 171, 198, 351
William IV. (Duke of Jülich-Cleves), 15, 27, 29, 47, 62, 199, 348, 351
William of Orange. *See* Orange
Wimpheling (chancellor of the Elector of Treves), 85, 101
Windsheim, Val. (Burgomaster of Tirschenreuth), 219
Winheim, Erhard (Carthusian), 202 (*n.* 2)
Winnéberg, Joh. v. (Canon at Strasburg and Cologne)
Winzet, Ninian (Abbot of Scotch monastery at Ratisbon), 337
Wittelsbach (House of), 60, 245, 273 (*n.* 3), 280, 281
Wittgenstein, George v. (Canon at Strasburg and Cologne), 175
Wolf, Dietrich (Archbishop of Salzburg). *See* Raittenau
Wolfgang von Dalberg (Archbishop of Mayence), 18, 37, 60, 65 f., 83, 89, 90 (*n.* 1), 126, 245
Wolfgang, William (Count Palatine of Neuburg). 517
Wolkenstein, Karl Friedr. v. (commander of the Teutonic Knights), 477
Wurm (burgomaster at Donauwörth), 458

Xanchius, Hieron. (agitator at Strasburg), 97
Zane, Matteo (Venetian ambassador at Constantinople), 184 (*n.* 1)
Zierotin, Karl v., 502 f., 507, 510
Zimmermann (superintendent at Graz), 391
Zuleger, Wenzel, 87
Zwingli, Zwinglians, 2, 8, 50, 70, 116, 155, 209, 225

END OF THE NINTH VOLUME.

Spottiswoode & Co., Ltd., Printers, New-street Square, London.

00031779

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020